CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter reports and discusses the outcome of the data analysis and presents the answers to the study's research problems. The results and discussion are ordered according to the two research problems. The main findings are presents below:

A. Description of The Data

1. The Result of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores

The comparison pre-test and post test score of students' vocabulary acquisition were presented in table 4.1 below:

	E	xperiment	al Class		Control Class				
	Students!	score					Score		
No	Code	Pre- Test	Post-Test	Gain	No	Students' Code	Pre- Test	Post-Test	Gain
1	C-1	16	25	9	1	B-1	10	18	8
2	C-2	14	22	8	2	B-2	32	40	8
3	C-3	18	27	9	3	B-3	11	30	19
4	C-4	8	29	21	4	B-4	30	48	18
5	C-5	11	19	8	5	B-5	21	25	4
6	C-6	12	17	5	6	B-6	26	28	2
7	C-7	10	12	2	7	B-7	23	24	1
8	C-8	10	30	20	8	B-8	23	26	3
9	C-9	6	17	11	9	B-9	10	14	4
10	C-10	9	13	4	10	B-10	23	31	8
11	C-11	18	26	8	11	B-11	21	41	20
12	C-12	6	26	20	12	B-12	34	45	9
13	C-13	12	27	15	13	B-13	31	31	0

Table 4.1The Result of Pre-test and Post-test Scores

Total	150	290	140	14	B-14	11	18	7
Mean	11,5	22,3	10,8	15	B-15	29	39	10
Lowest	6	12		16	B-16	19	25	6
Highest	18	30			Total	354	483	129
STDEV	4.034	6.074			Mean	22.12	30,18	8.1
			-		Lowest	10	14	
					Highest	34	48	

STDEV

8.156

From the table above the mean scores of pre-test and post-test of experimental class were 11.5 and 22.3 respectively. Meanwhile, the highest scores pre-test and post-test of the experimental class were 18 and 30 respectively, then the lowest scores pre-test and post-test of the experimental class were 6 and 12. In addition, the mean scores pre-test and post-test of control class were 22.12 and 30.18 respectively. Afterward, the highest scores pre-test and post-test of control class were 34 and 48. And the lowest scores pre-test and post-test of the control class were 10 and 14 respectively.

2. The Result of Questionnaire

The Result of Questionnaire related to the students' attitudes towards incidental vocabulary learning to acquire the unknown word meanings in reading English texts and reading online newspapers, as shown below:

Table 4.2 The Result of Questionnaire about Attitudes towards Acquisition Words through Reading English Text

	Reading English Texts							
No Item Total Mean Percentage Level of Agreemen								
1	Q1	51	3,92	78,46	Moderately Agree			

10.008

2	Q2	50	3,85	76,92	Moderately Agree
3	Q3	52	4	80	Agree
4	Q4	52	4	80	Agree
5	Q5	48	3,69	73,85	Moderately Agree
6	Q6	50	3,85	76,92	Moderately Agree
7	Q7	49	3,77	75,38	Moderately Agree
8	Q8	50	3,85	76,92	Moderately Agree
9	Q9	52	4	80	Agree
10	Q10	52	4	80	Agree
11	Q11	48	3,69	73,85	Moderately Agree
12	Q12	52	4	80	Agree
13	Q13	47	3,62	72,31	Moderately Agree
14	Q14	49	3,77	75,38	Moderately Agree
15	Q15	51	3,77	78,46	Moderately Agree

As shown in the table 4.2, the means of the students' response to questionnaire items 1-9 were between 3.69 and 4.00 ranging from *agree* to *moderately agree* level. The students *agreed* that while reading English texts, they guessed the unknown word meanings from contextual clues in the text (mean = 4.00). The students *moderately agreed* that they acquired most vocabulary while reading English texts (mean = 3.92), and that English teachers should enhance vocabulary acquisition in context through reading (mean = 3.85). They *moderately agree* that they liked reading English texts in order to gain new words (mean = 3.85) and while reading familiar English texts, they could acquire vocabulary well (mean = 3.69). They *agreed* that while reading English texts in which they were interested, they could acquire more vocabulary (mean = 4.00) and reading English texts was the best and easiest way to develop their vocabulary knowledge (mean =

4.00). They *moderately agree* that the vocabulary they met while reading English texts could be remembered well (mean = 3.85) and that vocabulary acquisition in context gave them a sense of a word's use and meaning (mean = 3.77).

In terms of students' concern about learning words incidentally through reading to acquire the unknown word meanings, the results obtained from the questionnaire items 10-15 show that they worried about it to some extent. The means of their responses to these items were among 3.62-4.00 ranging from *moderately agree* to *agree* level. They were *agreed* that guessing unknown word meanings from the text context could lead to misinterpretation (mean = 4.00) and not knowing reading strategies made guessing unknown word meanings in the text context more difficult (mean = 4.00). They *moderately agreed* that not knowing guessing strategies made guessing unknown word meanings in the text context more difficult and took time and slowed down the reading process (mean = 3.62 and 3.69 respectively). They also *moderately agreed* that it was more difficult to guess the meaning of unknown words from the context when they were not familiar with the content of the text (mean = 3.77) and when they did not know the meanings of the words surrounding the target word (mean = 3.77).

Table 4.3 The Result of Questionnaire about Attitudes towards Acquisition Words through Reading Online Newspapers

	Reading Online Newspapers							
No	Item	Total	Mean	Percentage	Level of Agreement			
1	Q16	51	3,92	78,46	Moderately Agree			

2	Q17	52	4	80	Agree
3	Q18	52	4	80	Agree
4	Q19	50	3,85	76,92	Moderately Agree
5	Q20	54	4,15	83,08	Agree
6	Q21	48	3,69	73,85	Moderately Agree
7	Q22	45	3,46	69,23	Moderately Agree
8	Q23	53	4,08	81,54	Agree
9	Q24	47	3,62	72,31	Moderately Agree
10	Q25	48	3,69	73,85	Moderately Agree
11	Q26	50	3,85	76,92	Moderately Agree
12	Q27	47	3,62	72,31	Moderately Agree
13	Q28	48	3,69	73,85	Moderately Agree
14	Q29	52	4	80	Agree

As seen in the table 4.3, the means of the students' responses to the questionnaire items 16-25 asking for their attitudes towards learning words incidentally through reading online newspapers to acquire the unknown word meanings were between 3.46-4.15 ranging from *moderately agree* to *agree* level. The students *agreed* that reading news in online newspaper helped them acquire vocabulary (mean = 4.00) and at the same time enabled them to develop their reading skill (mean = 4.00). The students *moderately agreed* that news in online newspapers aroused their interest and motivated them to read (mean = 3.92) and also, they considered acquisition words while reading news in online newspapers was useful (mean = 3.85); in addition, the students *agreed* that it was enjoyable to read it (mean = 4.15). They *moderately agreed* that guessing the meaning of unknown word during reading news in online newspapers was not boring but challenging

(mean = 3.69) and that they could guess the meanings of unknown words while reading familiar news well (mean = 3.62). Moreover, they *moderately agreed* that they would read news in online newspapers to develop their vocabulary knowledge in the future (mean = 3.69). They were *moderate in agreement* that it was not difficult to guess the meaning of unknown word meanings while reading news in online newspapers (mean = 3.46) and they *agreed* that words acquired from reading news in online newspapers could be retained well (mean = 4.08).

In terms of students' concern about learning words incidentally through reading news in online newspapers to acquire the unknown word meanings, the result obtained from the questionnaire items 26-29 reveal that they were upset about it to some an extent. The means of their responses to these items were among 3.62-4.00 which is the *moderately agree* to *agree*. They *agreed* that news in online newspapers did not motivate them to read because it used difficult vocabulary (mean = 3.85) and structures (mean = 3.62). It was difficult to guess the meanings of unknown word when they were not familiar with the content of the news (mean = 3.69) and they *agreed* that It was difficult to guess the meanings of unknown word when they did not know the meanings of the surrounding words (mean = 4.00).

B. Result of Data Analysis

1. The Result of Pre-Test Score

The students' pre-test score were distributed in the following table in order to analyze the students' knowledge before conducting the treatment. The result of pre-test, as shown in table 4.4 below:

	Exper	imental Clas	<u>s</u>		Con	trol Group	
	Students'	S	core		Students'	sco	re
No	Code	Pre-Test	Word Level	No	Code	Pre-Test	Word Level
1	C-1	16	1600	1	B-1	10	1000
2	C-2	14	1400	2	B-2	32	3200
3	C-3	18	1800	3	B-3	11	1100
4	C-4	8	800	4	B-4	30	3000
5	C-5	11	1100	5	B-5	21	2100
6	C-6	12	1200	6	B-6	26	2600
7	C-7	10	1000	7	B-7	23	2300
8	C-8	10	1000	8	B-8	23	2300
9	C-9	6	600	9	B-9	10	1000
10	C-10	9	900	10	B-10	23	2300
11	C-11	18	1800	11	B-11	21	2100
12	C-12	6	600	12	B-12	34	3500
13	C-13	12	1200	13	B-13	31	3100
	Total	150		14	B-14	11	1100
	Mean	11,5		15	B-15	29	2900
	Lowest	6		16	B-16	19	1900
	Highest	18			Total	354	
	STDEV	4,034			Mean	22.12	
					Lowest	10	
					Highest	34	

STDEV

8,156

 Table 4.4

 Pre-Test Score of Experimental and Control Class

The table above showed that comparison of pre-test score achieved by experimental and control class students, both classes' achievement were at the different level. It can be seen that from students' score, the highest scores were 18 and the lowest score was 6 of experimental class compared with control class, the highest scores were 34 and the lowest score 10.

a. The Result of Pre-Test Score of Experimental Class

1) Frequency Distribution

Based on the data above, it was known the highest score was 18 and the lowest score was 6. Afterwards, it was presented using frequency distribution, as shown in table 4.5 below:

				The		
Class	Interval	Frequency	Mid	Limitation of	Frequency	Frequency
(K)	(I)	(F)	Point (x)	each group	Relative (%)	Cumulative (%)
1	6 – 8	3	7	5.5 - 8.5	23.08	100
2	9 - 11	4	10	8.5 - 11.5	30.77	84.61
3	12 - 14	3	13	11.5 – 14.5	23.078	76.92
4	15 - 17	1	16	14.5 – 17.5	7.69	53.85
5	18 - 20	2	19	17.5 - 20.5	15.38	23.08
	Ν	13			100	

Table 4.5Frequency Distribution of the Pre-test

The frequency distribution of students' pre-test score can also be

seen in the following figure.



Figure 4.1 The Frequency Distribution of Experiment Class Pre-Test Score

It can be seen from the figure above about the students' pre-test score. There were three students who got score among 6-8. There were four students who got score among 9-11. There were three students who got score among 12-14. There was one student who got score among 15-17 and there were two students who got score among 18-20.

Based on the pre-test score of experiment class which is classified into word level, there were six students who got score among 6-10, so their word level was 100-1000 word level. There were seven students who got score between 11-18, so their word level was 1100-2000 word level.

2) Normality Test

One-Sample Ke	olmogorov-Smirnov T	'est
		Pretest_C
Ν		13
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	11,5385
	Std. Deviation	4,03351
Most Extreme	Absolute	,147
Differences	Positive	,147
	Negative	-,099
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Z	,529
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,942

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of experiment class was 0.942. Then the normality of experiment class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5% (α =0.05). Because asymptotic significance of experiment was 0.942 \geq 0.05. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

b. The Result of Pre-Test Score of Control Class

1) Frequency Distribution

Based on the data above, it was known the highest score was 34 and the lowest score was 10. Afterwards, it was presented using frequency distribution, as shown in table 4.6 below:

			•	The		
				Ine		
				Limitation		Frequency
Class	Interval	Frequency	Mid	of each	Frequency	Cumulative
(K)	(T)	(\mathbf{F})	Point (v)	group	Relative (%)	(%)
(11)	(1)	(1)		group	Relative (70)	(70)
1	10 to 14	4		10.5 – 14.5	25	100
_			12			
2	15 to 10	1		14 5 - 19 5	6 2 5	75
2	15 10 19	1	17	1110 1710	0,20	10
			17			
3	20 to 24	5		19.5 – 24.5	31,25	62,5
5	20 10 2 1	5	22		,	
				24.5 20.5	10.5	21.25
4	25 to 29	2		24.5 – 29.5	12,5	31,25
			27			
5	30 to 34	1	32	29.5 - 34.5	25	25
5	501054	+	52			-0
		16			100	
	Ν					

 Table 4.6

 Frequency Distribution of the Pre-tes

The frequency distribution of students' pre-test score can also be seen in

the following figure.



It can be seen from the figure above about the students' pre-test score. There were four students who got score among 10-14. There was one student who got score among 15-19. There were five students who got score among 20-24. There were two students who got score among 25-29. There were four students who got score among 30-34.

Based on the pre-test score of control class which is classified into word level, there were two students who got score10, so their word level was 100-1000 word level. There were three students who got score between 11-19, so their word level was 1100-2000 word level. There were eight students who got score between 21-30, so their word level was 2100-3000 word level. The last, there were three students who got score between 31-35, so their word level was 3100-4000 word level.

2) Normality Test

	0	Pretest_B
N		16
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	22,1875
	Std. Deviation	8,25606
Most Extreme	Absolute	,162
Differences	Positive	,162
	Negative	-,130
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	Z	,649
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,793

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of control class was 0.793. Then the normality of control class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5% (α =0.05). Because asymptotic significance

of experiment was $0.793 \ge 0.05$. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

c. Homogeneity Test

		Levene			
		Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
IVA	Based on Mean	5,406	1	27	,028
	Based on Median	4,679	1	27	,040
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	4,679	1	20,417	,043
	Based on trimmed	5,404	1	27	,028
	mean				

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

Based on the calculating used SPPS 18.0 program, the data showed the significance was 0.028. The significant of the Levene test statistic was lower than 0.05 (0.028 \leq 0.05) or $X^2_{value} \geq X^2_{table}$ (5.406 \geq 3.841). It meant that the scores were not violated the homogeneity.

	Post-Test Score of Experimental and Control Class									
	Experime	ental Clas	S		Contro	ol Group				
	Score					Score				
	Students'	Post-	Word		Students'	Post-	Word			
No	Code	Test	Level	No	Code	Test	Level			
1	C-1	25	2500	1	B-1	18	1800			
2	C-2	22	2200	2	B-2	40	4000			
3	C-3	27	2700	3	B-3	30	3000			
4	C-4	29	2900	4	B-4	48	4800			
5	C-5	19	1900	5	B-5	25	2500			
6	C-6	17	1700	6	B-6	28	2800			
7	C-7	12	1200	7	B-7	24	2400			
8	C-8	30	3000	8	B-8	26	2600			
9	C-9	17	1700	9	B-9	14	1400			

 Table 4.7

 Post-Test Score of Experimental and Control Class

						31	
10	C-10	13	1300	10	B-10		3100
11	C-11	26	2600	11	B-11	41	4100
12	C-12	26	2600	12	B-12	45	4500
13	C-13	27	2700	13	B-13	31	3100
Total		290		14	B-14	18	18
Mean		22,3		15	B-15	39	39
Lowest		12		16	B-16	25	25
Highest		30		Total		483	
STDEV 6.074			Mean		30,18		
				Lowest	14		
				Highest		48	
					STDEV	10.008	

The table above showed that comparison of post-test score achieved by experimental and control class students. Both classes showed the different score, the highest score for the experimental class was 30 and 48 for the control class. And about the lowest score, for the experimental class was 12 and for the control class was 14. It meant that the experimental class and the control class have the different level in the term of word level after treatment.

a. The Result of Post Test Score

1) Frequency Distribution

Based on the data above, it was known the highest score was 30 and the lowest score was 12 for experiment class. Afterwards, it was presented using frequency distribution, as shown in table 4.8 below:

	Frequency Distribution of the Post-test								
Class (K)	Interval (I)	Frequency (F)	Mid Point (x)	The Limitation of each group	Frequency Relative (%)	Frequency Cumulative (%)			
1	12 to 15	2	13,5	11.5 – 15.5	15,385	100			
2	16 to 19	3	17,5	15.5 – 19.5	23,077	84,615			
3	20 to 23	1	21,5	19.5 – 23.5	7,692	46,154			
4	24 to 27	5	25,5	23.5 - 27.5	38,462	38,462			
5	28 to 31	2	29,5	27.5 - 31.5	15,385	15,385			
	N	13			100				

 Table 4.8

 Frequency Distribution of the Post-tes

The frequency distribution of students' post-test score can also be seen in

the following figure.



It can be seen from the figure above about the students' post-test score. There were two students who got score among 12-15. There were three students who got score among 16-19. There was one student who got score among 20-23. There were five students who got score among 24-27. There were two students who got score among 28-31.

Based on the pre-test score of experiment class which is classified into word level, there were five students who got score12-19, so their word level was 11-2000 word level. There were eight students who got score between 22-30, so their word level was 2100-3000 word level.

2) Normality Test

One-bample r	Connegor ov-Shini no	v I Cot
		Posttest_C
Ν		13
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	22,3077
	Std. Deviation	6,07433
Most Extreme	Absolute	,210
Differences	Positive	,117
	Negative	-,210
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	Z	,756
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,617

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of experiment class was 0.617. Then the normality of experiment class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5% (α =0.05). Because asymptotic significance of experiment was 0.617 \geq 0.05. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

b. The Result of Post Test Score

1) Frequency Distribution

Based on the data above, it was known the highest score was 48 and the lowest score was 14. Afterwards, it was presented using frequency distribution, as shown in table 4.9 below:

Frequency Distribution of the Post-test									
				The Limitation		Frequency			
Class	Interval	Frequency	Mid	of each	Frequency	Cumulative			
(K)	(I)	(F)	Point (x)	group	Relative (%)	(%)			
1	14 to 20	3	17	13.5 – 20.5	18,750	100			
2	21 to 27	4	24	20.5 - 27.5	25,000	87,500			
3	28 to 34	4	31	27.5 - 34.5	25,000	68,750			
4	35 to 41	3	38	34.5 - 41.5	18,750	43,750			
5	42 to 48	2	45	41.5 - 48.5	12,500	25,000			
	N	16			100				

Table 4.9Frequency Distribution of the Post-test

The frequency distribution of students' post-test score can also be seen in

the following figure.



Figure 4.4

14 to 2021 to 2728 to 3435 to 4142 to 48It can be seen from the figure above about the students' post-test score.There were three students who got score among 14-20. There were fourstudents who got score among 21-27. There were four students who got scoreamong 28-34. There were three students who got score among 35-41. Therewere two students who got score among 42-48.

Based on the post-test score of control class which is classified into word level, there were three students who got score14-18, so their word level was 11-2000 word level. There were six students who got score between 24-30, so their word level was 2100-3000 word level. There were four students who got score between 31-40, so their word level was 3100-4000. And there were three students who got score between 41-48, so their word level was 4100-5000.

2) Normality Test

	0	
		Posttest_B
Ν		16
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	30,1875
	Std. Deviation	10,00812
Most Extreme	Absolute	,155
Differences	Positive	,155
	Negative	-,123
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	,621	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,836

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on the calculation used SPSS program, the asymptotic significance normality of control class was 0.836. Then the normality of control class was consulted with table of Kolmogorov- Smirnov with the level of significance 5% (α =0.05). Because asymptotic significance of control was 0.836 \geq 0.05. It could be concluded that the data was normal distribution.

c. Homogeneity Test

		Levene			
		Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
IVA	Based on Mean	2,538	1	27	,123
	Based on Median	2,292	1	27	,142
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2,292	1	24,645	,143
	Based on trimmed	2,517	1	27	,124
	mean				

Test of Homogeneity of Variance

Based on Mean from the calculating used SPPS 18.0 program, the data showed the significance was 0.123. The significant of the Levene test statistic was higher

than 0.05 (0.123 \ge 0.05) or $X^2_{value} \le X^2_{table}$ (2.538 \le 3.841). It meant that the scores were homogeneous.

d. Testing Hypothesis

The researcher used Paired Sample T Test to test the hypothesis with significance level α = 0.05. The researcher used manual calculation and SPSS 18.0 Program to test the hypothesis using Paired Sample T Test and mean formula. The criteria of Ho was rejected when t _{value} \geq t _{table} or -t _{value} \leq -t _{table} and Ho was accepted if t _{value} \leq t _{table} or -t _{value} \geq -t _{table}. Then the criteria H_a is accepted when t_{value} \geq -t _{table}, and H_a is refused when t_{value} \leq t_{table} or -t _{value} \geq -t _{table} or -t _{value} \geq -t _{table} or -t _{value} \geq -t _{table}.

To measure the effect of reading online newspaper toward the students' vocabulary acquisition incidentally, SPSS 18.0 statistic program was conducted in this study.

Based on the SPSS 18.0, the result shown below:

				Std.	Std. Error	
		Mean	Ν	Deviation	Mean	
Pair 1	Before Reading Online	11,54	13	4,034	1,119	
	Newspapers					
	After Reading Online	22,31	13	6,074	1,685	
	Newspapers					

Paired Samples Statistics

Based on the calculation above showed that the mean score before reading online newspapers and after reading newspapers was increased (11.54 to 22.31). it meant that any improvement of the students' vocabulary acquisition incidentally.

Paired Samples Correlations

			Correlatio	
		Ν	n	Sig.
Pair 1	Before Reading Online	13	,272	,369
	Newspapers & After			
	Reading Online			
	Newspapers			

Based on the calculation above showed that significant value was higher than alpha (0.369) \geq 0.05 or t_{table} was lower than t_{value} (0.272 \leq 0.602) which is (db) = 13-2 = 11. Thus, there is no significant correlation between before reading online newspapers and after reading newspapers. It meant that any influence or effect each other.

		Paired Differences							
			Std.	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-
		Mean	Deviation	Mean	Lower	Upper	Т	df	tailed)
Pair	Before Reading	-10,769	6,313	1,751	-14,584	-6,954	-6,150	12	,000
1	Online								
	Newspapers -								
	After Reading								
	Online								
	Newspapers								

Paired Samples Test

Based on the calculation above showed that significant score was (.000), so it meant that the data were significant. Because of the score of $t_{table} \le t_{value}$ in 5% and 1% significant value (-(2.179) \le -6.150 \ge -(3.055)) with degree of freedom (df) is 12 (13-1).

Beside that, the researcher also used mean formula to know the students' attitudes. The mean score of the students attitude showed that the students' respond in reading English texts and reading online newspaper were *moderately agree* to *agree* respectively. The mean score for reading English texts was 3.62-4.00 and for reading online newspapers was 3.46-4.15. Beside that, the students gave positive attitudes while in teaching learning process also.

C. Discussion

The result of analysis showed that there was significant effect of reading online newspapers toward students' vocabulary acquisition incidentally by the third semester students of the English Education Department at IAIN Palangka Raya. It was shown that reading online newspapers gave significant effect toward students' vocabulary acquisition incidentally. With the significant value was higher than alpha (-(2.179) \leq - 6.150 \geq -(3.055)).

There were several reasons why reading online newspaper can effect to students' vocabulary acquisition incidentally, those are:

First, by reading, the students can improve their knowledge and ability about every thing what they want. They can find the important information, the unknown words, they also can interprete what they read using their prior knowledge. The finding was suitable with K. Michael Hibbard & Elizabeth A. Wagner state in *Assessing and Teaching Reading Comprehension and Writing* in the chapter one page one *Reading* is a complex behavior decoding words, developing fluency, and improving comprehension.⁷⁴ Beside that, students can gain the unknown words incidentally. The finding suitable with Huckin and Coady state in Wilaiwan that incidental vocabulary acquisition through reading refers to the acquisition of unknown vocabulary as a by-product of reading.⁷⁵

Second, by reading online newspapers, the students can guess the unknown words from the context, because of the contain of newspaper related with their life. Thus, the students can improve their vocabulary acquisition easily. The finding appropriate with the finding of Juhari Sham's study which used newspapers as an authentic reading material indicated that authentic reading materials were effective in helping the students to enhance and enrich their vocabulary acquisition.⁷⁶

So, by reading online newspapers can improve their vocabulary size because of the students can acquire new vocabulary while they reading it, incidentally.

The last, from this finding, students showed the positive attitude while or after reading, not only reading English texts but also online newspapers. However, not over all the learning process had positive attitude especially in the term of how to guess the unknown words itself. This finding support the previous study from Wilaiwan' finding on her study that the result obtained on the 29-item questionnaire reveal that the

⁷⁴ K. Michael Hibbard & Elizabeth A. Wagner. *Assessing and Teaching Reading Comprehension and Writing*, *3-5*. Vol 4. 2003. Eye On Education: London. p. 1

⁷⁵ Wilaiwan Lebkatem. *loc. cit.* p. 5

⁷⁶Juhari Sham bin Jusoh. 2016.

https://www.academia.edu/28041647/USING AUTHENTIC READING MATERIALS TO IMPROVE STUDENTS VOCABULARY ACQUISITION

subjects had positive attitudes towards learning words through reading both type of the texts. However they showed some concerns about this vocabulary learning process and found it disconcerting especially when they did not know the word surrounding the target words and the content of the text. ⁷⁷ Beside that, the students gave positive attitude when they followed the teaching learning process. Because, to measure the students attitudes which used questionnaire is not enough, but the process is important one.