The Reading Matrix © 2009
Volume 9, Number 1, April 2009

Extensive Reading: Students' Performance and Perception

Nelly Fernandez de Morgado
Universidad Simón Bolívar

ABSTRACT

Reading is thought to be a crucial skill in the EFL learning process, and Extensive Reading a very useful strategy. However, very few teachers implement it on a regular basis. The process of introducing Extensive Reading (ER) is considered far too expensive, complicated, and time-consuming. One way to encourage its use would be to more deeply understand the multiple factors influencing its successful implementation. This paper considers two of these factors, one related to effectiveness and the other to attitude. On the one hand, it examines Extensive Reading's influence on the student's reading comprehension performance. On the other, it explores the student's perception of this particular strategy. The study uses quantitative as well as qualitative data from students in the first year of a scientific reading course in a Venezuelan university. Findings suggest that reading comprehension performance was essentially the same with or without an Extensive Reading Program. Nonetheless, the program did seem to positively impact participating students. The ER Group did significantly better in the post-test than in the pre-test. Furthermore, the students' perception of Extensive Reading was very positive. Besides being enjoyable, they felt it helped them build vocabulary, reading comprehension, reading skills and confidence.

INTRODUCTION

Just as cycling is best learned by riding a bicycle, so is reading by reading. This is the most important belief underlying Extensive Reading's validity (Smith, 1985). Extensive Reading (ER) has been broadly researched and its benefits, for both first and second language learners, are well-known (Elley & Mangubhai, 1983; Hafiz & Tudor, 1989, 1990; Coady, 1997; Day & Bamford, 1998; Shin, 2004; Hunt & Beglar, 2005; Pretorius & Manpuru, 2007). However, many are the difficulties and hindrances that are encountered in order to apply it successfully and consistently (Susser & Robb, 1990; Greaney, 1996; Lituanas, Jacobs, & Renandya, 1999). Among the many obstacles a teacher has to overcome, especially in poor or underdeveloped countries, are: (a) scarcity of reading materials; (b) lack of adequate preparation of teachers; (c) pressures to cover the entire syllabus and text books, leaving no time for programs such as ER; (d) exam pressure and inflexibility of compulsory assessment activities; and finally (e) the fact that part-to-whole instruction, as the means to attain literacy and lifelong skills, is still a broadly held belief.

Nonetheless, reading has been the most emphasized skill in traditional EFL teaching. Today, there is great pressure on EFL reading teachers to move from "teaching texts to teaching reading" (Haas & Flower, 1988, p. 169). There is enough evidence to conclude that Extensive Reading by itself can help students (who already have a certain level of ability in English) learn to read (Susser & Robb, 1990). Therefore, ER becomes a valuable, almost expected tool to achieve such a goal. Conversely, research on ER strategy and implementation still falls short in providing enough information about either its pedagogical aspects or its effectiveness (Haas & Flower, 1988). Further research on these topics is therefore highly valued. The present study aims at making a contribution in this matter.

In this paper, the effect of an Extensive Reading Program (ERP) on students' reading comprehension performance is assessed. The paper also targets some aspects related to learners' assumptions and attitudes, aspects believed to be closely related to the successful implementation of any kind of learning strategy (Harms, 1994; Lumsden, 1994; Raffini, 1995; Rogers, 1997; Mendler, 2001; Hwang, 2002; Yamasita, 2004). Hence this paper explores students' perception of ER with regard to (a) their enjoyment and (b) ER's usefulness in improving vocabulary, reading skills, reading comprehension and autonomy. It is hoped that the findings and suggestions herein will provide ideas for enhancing the experiences of those students and teachers who use Extensive Reading as part of their L2 learning and teaching.

Method

The present study is framed under the classroom research methodology and the action research approach. Hence the researcher uses her students and classroom as subjects and setting, and the results aim at the improvement of her practice as a teacher. Wallace (quoted by Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 216) defines action research as "basically a way of reflecting on your teaching … by systematically collecting data on your every day practice and analyzing it in order to come to some decisions about what your future practice should be." It can be seen that this form of inquiry is situated and context dependent. It inclines towards teacher and learner progress rather than theory building.

Although publishing action research studies might be considered controversial for some stringent positivists, action research can provide valuable insights both to the teacher and to the field. Nonetheless, it is important to warn the reader that, while the results discussed here may prove useful to anyone interested in Extensive Reading, they must not be understood to apply to all students in all classrooms.

As far as action research in practice is concerned, it is important to note that there are a variety of ways to undertake it. The present study embraced the steps proposed by Mackey and Gass (*op. cit.* 217-219). First, the teacher identified a problem or concern within her own classroom: Would reading comprehension be enhanced if Extensive Reading were used? How would the students perceive it? Next a preliminary investigation was conducted to gather information about the topic of ER (a pilot study was carried out during the previous term). Then, the teacher formed assumptions and a hypothesis: Though her students might find it boring or too difficult, she predicted ER would help them improve their reading skills. Finally, the teacher assessed the effect of the practice. Gathering quantitative as well as qualitative data, she used a test to detect changes in reading comprehension and a questionnaire to capture students' perspectives and opinions.

Instruments

The Test for English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) is an academic English test meant to assess English proficiency in non-native speakers. More than 6,000 institutions and agencies in 110 countries rely on TOEFL scores to select students with the English skills needed to succeed in English-speaking universities (Educational Testing Service, 2007). The TOEFL test covers all features of English proficiency, including a test of reading comprehension. In this particular study, the researcher applied only scientific texts from the reading comprehension section (Phillips, 1996. Used by permission.). Four versions of the test were applied in the pre- as well as the post-tests.

In order to collect data about the students' perception of Extensive Reading, an *ad hoc* questionnaire was designed, pilot-tested, reoriented, and then applied. The instrument was intended to collect data on the main areas ER is believed to positively impact and which are of particular interest due to the course's objectives: vocabulary building, reading skills, reading comprehension, and autonomy. It also offered the students the opportunity to express their opinions about ER in terms of enjoyment and usefulness. In the trimester prior to the study, 50 students were exposed to an Extensive Reading experience. The *ad hoc* questionnaire, as well as the ER methodology, were piloted. This pilot study followed Pino-Silva's **(**2006) guidelines and suggestions. The final questionnaire can be found in Appendix B. It is important to note that data on the Control Group's attitudes about the pedagogical treatment they received was never collected. This is because the study's purpose was to (a) obtain information only about attitudes regarding extensive reading, the strategy in question; therefore, (b) comparing the two groups on this matter was never considered an objective of the study.

Setting

Universidad Simón Bolívar is one of the most prestigious universities in Venezuela. It is a science-based institution. Engineering, basic sciences (Math, Physics, Chemistry), Architecture and Biology are among its majors. With the exception of the future architects, all students have to pass a three-level EFL scientific reading course in their first year. These trimester-long courses are named ID1111, ID2112, and ID1113 respectively. Students can be exempted from a course or courses by performing well on a placement test. However, as a result more than 800 students still have to take the series. Although traditionally the course has been designed for use with a predetermined text book, teachers are free to introduce resources and methodologies including Extensive Reading to aid learning.

The researcher applied the Extensive Reading Program (ERP) to 30 of her students from the third-level EFL scientific reading course (IDI113, April-July 2008 term). The students attended class on campus the traditional four hours a week. ER was employed during class time for a duration of 45 minutes once a week; the rest of the class time followed the regular strategy.

Running separately from the ER program and its teacher, the control group was otherwise subject to the same conditions: 30 students from the same level. Variables such as (a) previous courses, (b) class day and time, (c) number of class hours, (d) course book and course learning strategy, (e) pre- and post-comprehension tests, and (f) the times the tests were administered were the same for both groups.

The Control Group followed regular class dynamics which consisted of a combination of intensive reading, reading strategies theory and practice, and vocabulary learning through video

watching. While Extensive Reading is defined as the reading of large quantities of material for information or pleasure in an autonomous way, intensive reading consists of reading small amounts of text under a teacher's supervision. For this course, the focus of the intensive reading was mainly on language skills such as learning specific vocabulary and reading strategies. Although the texts varied in length, they were usually at the students' instructional reading level. In the case of ER, students' reading level is not considered.

The ER program was set and implemented following suggestions and guidelines taken from Pino-Silva (2006), Scott-Conley (n.d.), and Susser and Robb (1990). The whole process involved three main steps: (a) setting up the library, (b) teaching preparation, and (c) assessment tools. To set up the library, the students were asked to bring in four articles. These articles had to meet the following characteristics: be (a) on a scientific topic in any field, (b) of interest and appeal to the student, (c) on current issues or innovations, and (d) one page long, typed in Times New Roman 12-point, to include references and pictures, printed in color and placed in a plastic cover.

Students were also requested to send an electronic file to the teacher (this was meant for future reproduction if needed). To encourage the establishment of the library, the students were given a grade on this step. The library also included articles students from previous courses had brought.

The steps the teacher took to learn about ER included: (a) research on the web including into databases related to setting, implementation, motivation, relevance, influence and the impact ER is believed to have on L2 learning; and (b) research into how ER had been implemented in this University previously, including teachers' experiences and perceptions.

To implement ER in the classroom using class sets and self-selected articles, the teacher established the following steps and conditions: (a) ER was utilized during class hours; (b) time invested in ER in the classroom was 45-minutes a week, enough to cause an impact without tiring or boring the students (most did not have a reading habit); (c) ER was done at the beginning of class, on a fixed day (Thursdays); and (d) two folders with several color copies of the articles were set out in the front of the classroom.

Students approached the folders and picked whatever articles appealed to them most. To start the first round of reading, the teacher spread small piles of articles around the classroom so students could pick from there. Once students had finished a reading and filled out an activity sheet on it, they would again approach the folders in front of the room and pick another article. Students would quietly read as many articles as they could for 45 minutes. A fixed number of bonus points were assigned and given to those students who would bring in reports from readings done at home. The assessment tools implemented in the program included: (a) pre- and post-tests of reading comprehension; and (b) an ER activity sheet that requested the student to record the following: reading speed, main idea, writer's purpose, and new words (see Appendix A).

Analysis and Interpretation

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data from pre- and post-tests. The statistic ***Student's t*** was used to compare means in order to discover whether the ERP influenced reading comprehension in any significant way. Frequencies and percentages were used to interpret the students' responses to the questionnaire.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results and discussion from the reading comprehension pre- and post-tests, as well as students' responses to the questionnaire on perception, are presented in the following sections. First, the Control Group's results from both pre- and post-tests are described statistically. Then follows a descriptive analysis of the results from the Extensive Reading Group's reading comprehension pre- and post-tests. Next, a comparison of the two groups is presented. Finally, an account of opinions and comments provided by students from the Extensive Reading Group is given.

Control Group Reading Comprehension Test Results

Control Group Pre-test Results

The results in Table 1 show that all students performed above the passing grade (5 points over 10). The number repeated most was 6.75 points. The lowest grade was 5.50 and the highest was 9.25. Fifty percent of the students were above 7.37. Averaged, all students came out at 7.56. They deviated 0.99 units from the average.

Control Group Post-test Results

The results in Table 1 show that most students performed above passing grade (5 points over 10). The number repeated most was 7.18 points. The lowest grade was 3.85 and the highest was 9.49. Fifty percent of the students were above 7.44. Averaged, all students came out at 7.59. They deviated 1.22 units from the average.

Control Group's Post-test Results Compared to Pre-test Results

Table 1 shows that the value for ***t*** in the ***Student's t*** distribution is 0.142 and the *p-value* associated with the statistic of contrast "Sig. (bilateral)" is 0.888. Since the *p-value* is greater than 0.05, then, at a 0.05 significance level the means are equal. Therefore, results from the post-test are not significantly different from the pre-test. This result suggests that the method used did not help improve the Control Group's reading compression in a significant way.

Table 1. Control Group's Reading Comprehension Pre- and Post-tests Descriptive Statistics

		PRE-TEST	**POST-TEST**	***Student's t*** †	**Sig. (bilateral)**
N	Valid	30	30		
	Lost	0	0		
Mean		7.5583	7.5897	0.142	0.888
Median		7.3750	7.4359		
Mode††		6.75	7.18		
Stand. Dev.		0.9993	1.2150		
Minimum		5.50	3.85		
Maximum		9.25	9.49		

† The values for the ***Student's t*** distribution interval are: inferior – 0.4223; superior – 0.4852. The bilateral grade of significance is 0.003. The confidence interval for the difference is 95%.
†† There are several modes. The table shows the lowest one.

Extensive Reading Group Reading Comprehension Test Results

Extensive Reading Group Pre-test Results

The results in Table 2 show that all students performed above passing grade (5 points over 10). The number repeated most was 6.67 points. The lowest grade was 6.19 and the highest was 9.05. Fifty percent of the students were above 7.38. Averaged, all students came out at 7.46. They deviated 0.78 units from the average.

Extensive Reading Group Post-test Results

The results in Table 2 show that all the students performed above passing grade (5 points over 10). The number repeated most was 7.18 points. The lowest grade was 6.67 and the highest was 10. Fifty percent of the students were above 7.95. Averaged, all students came out at 7.92. They deviated 0.76 units from the average.

Extensive Reading Group's Post-test Results Compared to Pre-test Results

Table 2 shows that the value for ***t*** in the ***Student's t*** distribution is 3.323 and the *p-value* associated with the statistic of contrast "Sig. (bilateral)" is 0.002. Since the *p-value* is lower than 0.05, then at a 0.05 significance level the means are not equal. Therefore, results from the post-test are significantly different from the pre-test's. This result suggests that the Extensive Reading Program might have helped this group improve reading comprehension to a significant degree.

Table 2. Extensive Reading Group's Reading Comprehension Pre- and Post-test Descriptive Statistics

		PRE-TEST	**POST-TEST**	***Student's t*** †	**Sig. (bilateral)**
N	Valid	30	30		
	Lost	0	0		
Mean		7.4603	7.9231	3.323	0.002
Median		7.3810	7.9487		
Mode ††		6.67	7.18		
Stand. Dev.		.7768	.7629		
Minimum		6.19	6.67		
Maximum		9.05	10.00		

† The values for the ***Student's t*** *distribution* interval are: inferior 0.1779; superior 0.7476. The bilateral grade of significance is 0.003. The confidence interval for the difference is 95%.
††. There are several modes. The table shows the lowest one.

Difference Between Extensive Reading and Control Group Pre-Tests and Post-Tests

Difference Between Extensive Reading and Control Group Pre-Tests

Table 3 shows the ***Student's t*** for the pre-tests established by the values of the variable Extensive Reading Program (i.e., the difference between means in the Extensive Reading and the Control Group reading comprehension pre-tests). The *p-value* associated with the statistic of

contrast *F* ("Sig. = 0.133") is greater than 0.05; therefore, at 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis of equality of variances cannot be rejected.

As the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, the adequate *t* statistic to contrast the hypothesis of equality of means is the one that supposes that the variances are equal ("*t* = -0.424"). *The p-value* associated with the statistic of contrast ("Sig. (bilateral) = 0.673") is greater than 0.05. Therefore, at a 0.05 significance level, the hypothesis of equality of means is kept. Hence, there is no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

This analysis suggests that the ER group did not do significantly better than the control group before the ERP was applied. This result suggests that that both groups were similar in their reading comprehension performance at the start of the program.

Table 3. Difference Between Means in Extensive Reading and Control Group Reading Comprehension pre-tests

	ER Group Mean	**Control Group Mean**	***Levene F***	***F Sig.***	***Student's t***	**Sig. (Bilateral)**
Pre-test	7.4603	7.5583	2.320	0.133	-0.424	0.673

The bilateral grade of significance is 0.005. The confidence interval for the difference is 95%.

Difference Between Extensive Reading and Control Group Post-Tests

Table 4 shows the ***Student's t*** for the post-tests in the groups established by the values of the variable Extensive Reading Program (i.e., the difference between means from the Extensive Reading and the Control Group reading comprehension post-tests). The *p-value* associated with the statistic of contrast *F* ("Sig. = 0.056") is greater than 0.05. Therefore, at 0.05 significance level, the null hypothesis of equality of variances cannot be rejected.

As the null hypothesis cannot be rejected, the adequate *t* statistic to contrast the hypothesis of equality of means is the one that supposes that the variances are equal ("*t* = 1.237"). *The p-value* associated with the statistic of contrast ("Sig. (bilateral) = 0.208") is greater than 0.05; therefore, at a 0.05 significance level, the hypothesis of equality of means is kept. Hence, there is no significant difference between the means of the two groups.

This analysis suggests that the ER group did not do significantly better than the control group after the ERP was applied. This result suggests that the Extensive Reading Program did not make a significant difference in reading comprehension performance.

Table 4. Difference Between Means from Extensive Reading and Control Group Reading Comprehension Post-tests

	ER Group Mean	**Control Group Mean**	***Levene F***	***F Sig.***	***Student's t***	**Sig. (Bilateral)**
Post-test	7.9231	7.5897	3.791	0.056	1.273	0.208

The bilateral grade of significance is 0.05. The confidence interval for the difference is 95%.

Student Perception of Extensive Reading: Results from *ad hoc* Questionnaire

Student Perception of Extensive Reading

The results in Table 4 show that the students' perception of Extensive Reading was very favorable. After a whole term doing Extensive Reading, 90% of the students had a positive opinion of it. Table 4 also shows that 100% of the students thought it was useful; 93% enjoyed it; 90% felt it helped them improve their reading skills; 83% thought it helped them improve their vocabulary in English; 73% felt Extensive Reading helped them develop a habit for autonomous reading. As far as the level at which Extensive Reading should be applied, most students (90%) indicated that it should be used in the last term of the year; that is, Level ID1113. 73% thought it should be done in Level ID1112 whereas 43% of them thought it should be done in Level ID1111.

Table 4. Percentage of Positive Answers to the Yes/No Questions on the *Ad Hoc* Questionnaire

Category	% Positive Answers ("yes")
After a whole term, my opinion of ER is positive	90
Is it useful?	100
Did you enjoy it?	93
Did it help improve your reading skills?	90
Did it help you improve your vocabulary?	83
Did it help you develop a habit for autonomous reading?	73
Should it be done in ID1111? (Level 1)	43
Should it be done in ID1112 (Level 2)	73
Should it be done in ID1113 (Level 3)	90

Students' Comments on Extensive Reading

Table 5 shows that students' comments on Extensive Reading are very positive. Overall, students felt that their confidence, reading comprehension, vocabulary and reading skills were strengthened by the activity. Students thought Extensive Reading was very useful because it helped achieve the above. Most of them related enjoyment to the facts that (a) they were able to choose their readings; and (b) the topics were varied and interesting.

The analysis suggests that Extensive Reading seemed to influence the students for the better. First, in so far as reading comprehension performance is concerned, the ER Group did significantly better in the post-test than in the pre-test, which is not the case for the Control Group. Furthermore, concerning perception, the ER Group expressed a very favorable opinion of Extensive Reading, indicating that it had helped them build vocabulary, reading comprehension, reading skills, and confidence. Some even said that the abilities gained by the strategy would help them beyond the English learning process.

Table 5. Students' Comments Regarding Opinions of Extensive Reading

CATEGORY	COMMENTS
General opinion	It is a practical way of gaining confidence in reading English. I felt it helped me with comprehension and speed. I think it is a great technique. It is good to help develop the habit of reading in English. I thought it was great to get to know about new things in English. I think it is a very creative way to foster reading in English. It made the class somehow different and that is good. I liked it because it had me practice. It is a good method to relate us with the language. It is good practice which helps get me more fluent in English. I think it is a good method that we should use not only in English but in other languages.
Enjoyment	I enjoyed it because it allowed me to learn about many different and interesting things. I think I like English better now. I enjoyed the varied topics. I enjoyed it because the topics were very interesting. I found it enjoyable because I read about stuff that interested me. I found the topics interesting because they were about things I didn't know about. It was great to have the freedom to choose what you are to read. I enjoyed it because it was a mixture of entertainment and learning.
Usefulness	It is useful because it helps with vocabulary and speed. It helps develop skills for reading faster. I thought it was useful because it broadens my knowledge of technology and innovations. It helped me to get better at finding the main idea. I think it helped me improve in vocabulary and reading comprehension. I found it useful because it helped me learn English while learning about things that I enjoy. It helped me understand better the readings from our regular class text book. I feel reading my text book is easier now. I think it helps me get a better grade because it makes me a better reader.
Reading skills	It helps because I practiced a lot. I am not sure if it helps me with skills. I think it helped with my reading skills because the more you read the better you get at it. I think so, because we did it every week; regular practice is good. If I can do all this reading then I can also read a book. I was surprised to find out that I didn't have to look up every word in order to understand a text; that made me more confident and faster. It made me better at reading speed and comprehension.
Vocabulary enrichment	It helps me practice meaning from context. It helped me learn new words. I think it helped my vocabulary because of the varied topics and the regular practice. Yes, because it had me using my dictionary. I am certain I learned new words by guessing meaning from context. It helped me learn new vocabulary because I was forced to look up key words to gather the main idea.

When compared to the Control Group, the ER Group did not show a significant difference on the post-test suggesting that reading comprehension performance remains the same whether or not ERP is used. This result is problematical since it questions the effectiveness of ER as far as reading performance is concerned. One could plausibly argue that if the gains are only motivational, perhaps ER is not worth the trouble for the teacher. Nevertheless, we emphatically assert the reverse, that even if gains are only motivational, ER is still worthwhile. This is because motivation is not a matter to be treated lightly in the learning process. As we have mentioned before, it is a key factor to successful learning.

Whether our finding of increased motivation is a novelty effect or solid and replicable is a very difficult question to answer. This study was framed under the action research approach. As has been noted, action research is situated and context-dependent; its results are not intended to be generalized. Instead, its purpose is to help the individual teacher improve her practice. Therefore, our view is that a variety of research approaches should be used to continue studies on ER. Teachers are advised to gather findings in an eclectic fashion, using their best professional judgment to assess those findings' separate and cumulative significance.

Finally, reflecting on the data resulting from this study, it can be concluded that ER was a plus for L2 learning and that the teacher can enhance the process by ensuring the following: (a) reading material must be varied, appealing, interesting, yet challenging to its users; (b) there should be freedom as to what to read; (c) ER should be provided on a regular basis; (d) in this institutional setting, the most appropriate course for its use is ID1-113; and (d) if students are involved in the decision-making process, commitment and motivation are enhanced.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we considered two questions: (a) Does Extensive Reading (ER) influence students' reading comprehension performance? (b) What is the students' perception of ER? We used a TOEFL reading test to describe the reading comprehension performance of a group of students from a Venezuelan university. An *ad hoc* questionnaire was used to gather students' perceptions. Since this study was undertaken under the classroom research methodology and action research approach, conclusions are limited to the students in question.

The results must be discussed in three parts: first, comparison of the Control Group and the Extensive Reading Group as far as results from the pre-test and post-test are concerned; second, comparison of the pre- and post-tests of the students in the ERP; and finally, students' appreciation of the program.

First, regarding reading comprehension, students in the ERP did not show a significant difference from the Control Group either on the pre-test or on the post-test. This suggests that reading comprehension performance remains the same whether or not ERP is utilized. The statistical instrument used to compare the means from these tests was a *Student's t* test for independent samples. Interestingly, when the *Student's t* test for the same sample as opposed to independent samples was run to compare Control and ERP Group's post-test results, a significant difference was found. This suggests that, if these two groups had been statistically treated as belonging to the same sample, the reading comprehension performance of the students participating in the ERP program would have been significantly better than the other group.

Second, students in the ERP did significantly better on the post-test than the pre-test, while the Control Group did not. This suggests that Extensive Reading had a positive impact on

the students' reading comprehension. The statistical instrument used to compare the means from these tests was a *Student's t* test for the same sample.

Finally, students expressed high satisfaction regarding the Extensive Reading Program used for the course. Students felt it helped them build vocabulary, reading comprehension, reading skills, and confidence. This suggests that the students have a very positive perception of ER and would be willing to be involved in an Extensive Reading Program, especially one that would give them the opportunity to read about topics which are varied, appealing, and interesting to them, and the freedom to choose what to read.

Overall, it appears that—similarly to what Pretorius and Manpuru (2007) already stated—Extensive Reading does influence reading comprehension performance in important ways. Moreover, it seems to foster an attitude favorable to second-language learning. Since attitude is considered a very important aspect in the success and effectiveness of introducing and developing new learning environments (Rogers, 1997; Mendler, 2001; Hwang, 2002; Yamashita, 2004), further research should be undertaken to gather both quantitative and qualitative data. Such data will shed light on the many factors influencing the present findings, and could help significantly in developing good attitudes towards Extensive Reading Programs on the part of students and instructors alike.

REFERENCES

Coady, J. (1997). L2 vocabulary acquisition through extensive reading. In J. Coady & T. Huckin (Eds.), *Second language vocabulary acquisition* (pp. 225-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

David, R. H. (1997). Setting up an extensive reading program: Practical tips. *The Edinburgh project on extensive reading*. Edinburg University. Available at http://www.jalt-publications.org/tlt/files/97/may/hill.html

Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge: CUP.

Educational Testing Service (2007). Available at http://www.ets.org

Elley, W. B., & Mangubhai, F. (1983). The impact of reading on second language learning. *Reading Research Quarterly, 19,* 53-67.

Greaney, V. (Ed.). (1996). *Promoting reading in developing countries: Views on making reading materials accessible to increase literacy levels* (pp. 55-77). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Haas, C., & Flower, L. (1988). Rhetorical reading strategies and the construction of meaning. *College Composition and Communication, 39,* 167-83.

Hafiz, F. M., & Tudor, I. (1989). Extensive reading and the development of language skills. *ELT Journal, 43,* 4-13.

Hafiz, F. M., & Tudor, I. (1990). Graded readers as an input medium in L2 learning. *System, 18,* 31-42.

Harms, W. (1994). Enjoyment of learning crucial for students to excel. *The University of Chicago Chronicle, 13* (11). Available at: http://chronicle.uchicago.edu/940203/teens.shtml

Hunt, A., & Beglar, D. (2005). A framework for developing EFL reading vocabulary. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 17,* 23-59.

Hwang, Y., & Yi, M. (2002). Predicting the use of web-based information systems: Intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy. *Eighth Americas Conference on Information Systems*, pp. 1076-1081.

Lituanas, P. M., Jacobs, G. M., & Renandya, W. A. (1999). A study of extensive reading with remedial reading students. In Y. M. Cheah & S. M. Ng (Eds.) *Language instructional issues in Asian classrooms* (pp. 89-104). Newark, DE: International Development in Asia Committee, International Reading Association. Available: http://www.georgejacobs.net/extensive_1.html

Lumsden, L. (1994). Student motivation to learn. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management* (Online). Available: http://www.ericdigests.org/1995-1/learn.htm

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research. Methodology and design*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mendler, A. (2001). *Motivating students who don't care: Successful techniques for educators.* USA: Solution Tree.

Phillips, D. (1996). Longman preparation course for the TOEFL test. Practice tests (2nd ed.). NY: Longman.

Pino-Silva, J. (2006). Extensive reading through the internet: Is it worth the while? *The Reading Matrix*, *6* (1), 85-96.

Pretorius, J., & Manpuru, D. (2007). Playing football without a ball: Language, reading and academic performance in a high-poverty school. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 30 (1), 38-58.

Raffini, J. (1995). *150 Ways to increase intrinsic motivation*. USA: Allyn and Bacon.

Scott-Conley, L. (n.d.). *Starting an extensive reading program*. School for Int'l Training IEP, At Tokyo Jogakkan Jr. College. Available at: http://www.extensivereading.net/er/lois.html

Shin, F. (2004). Books, not direct instruction, are the key to vocabulary development. *Library Media Connection*, *22*, 20-21.

Smith, F. (1985). *Reading without nonsense* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rogers, S. (1997). *Motivation and learning: A teacher's guide to building excitement for learning and igniting the drive for quality*. USA: Peak Learning Systems.

Susser, B., & Robb, T. (1990). EFL extensive reading instruction: Research and procedure. *JALT Journal*, *12* (2). Available: http://www.kyoto-su.ac.jp/~trobb/sussrobb.html

Yamashita, J. (2004). Reading attitudes in L1 and L2, and their influence on L2 extensive reading. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, *16*, 1-19. Available at: http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2004/yamashita/yamashita.pdf

Acknowledgement: This paper has been proof read by Daniel Bailey, M.A. Professor of English as a Foreign Language at Universidad Simón Bolívar, Caracas, Venezuela.

Nelly Fernandez de Morgado *is currently pursuing a Ph.D. in Social Sciences at the Universidad Simón Bolívar (Caracas, Venezuela). She completed her Master's degree in Education in 2007 and a specialization in Educational Technology in 2002. In 1985, Ms. Fernandez received her undergraduate degree in Education and majored in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.*

E-mail: nellydemorgado@gmail.com or nfernandez@usb.ve

APPENDIX A

Extensive Reading Activity Sheet

Name _____ Section _____ Date _____

Title _____

Time start _____ finish_____ total time_____ No. Words_____

Main idea _____

Author's purpose _____

New words _____

I recommend this article YES □ NO □

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire on Student's Perception of Extensive Reading

What is your opinion about Extensive reading?

_____

Is it useful? _____ because _____

_____

Did you enjoy it? _____ because _____

_____

Did it help you improve your reading skills? _____ because _____

_____

Did it help you learn vocabulary? _____ because _____

_____

Did it help you develop a habit for autonomous reading? _____ because _____

_____

Please write any other opinions or comments you have on this activity:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____