ISSN: 0128-7702
Pertanika J. Soc. Sci. & Hum. **18 (2)**: 417 - 425 (2010) © Universiti Putra Malaysia Press

Review Paper

The Robustness of the Comprehension Hypothesis: A Review of Current Research and Implications for the Teaching of Writing

Setiono Sugiharto
Department of English, Faculty of Education,
Building G (Van Lith) 2nd Floor,
Atma Jaya Catholic University,
Jenderal Sudirman 51, Jakarta 12930
E-mail: setiono.sugiharto@atmajaya.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This article reviews what current research says about the effectiveness of the Comprehension Hypothesis. Drawing insights from the research under review, it then argues that despite the presence of other competing hypothesis (most notably, the Skill Building Hypothesis, the Output Hypothesis and, the Interaction Hypothesis), the Comprehension Hypothesis still stands as the most powerful means for facilitating the acquisition of literacy skills. The article also argues that the specific form of the Comprehension Hypothesis, namely the Reading Hypothesis, is more than sufficient to help learners become autonomous acquirers, the eventual goal of the second language acquisition theory. The article concludes by discussing the implications of the research for the teaching of writing.

Keywords: The Comprehension Hypothesis, the Reading Hypothesis, literacy skill, autonomous acquirers, the teaching of writing

INTRODUCTION

As one of the central theories in language acquisition, the Comprehension Hypothesis, which was formerly known as the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 2004), is often criticized on the ground that, though it is felt necessary, it is by itself insufficient for acquisition to take place. Ortega (2009), for example, argues that although input is ineluctably necessary, it cannot be sufficient. As a result, other popular hypotheses (most notably, the Skill-Building Hypothesis, the Output Hypothesis, and the Interaction Hypothesis) (Ortega, 2009) have emerged and contested the Comprehension Hypothesis (CH).

The Skill-Building Hypothesis claims that language is learnt consciously via learning individual rules, which through drills and exercises can be made automatic. The Output Hypothesis claims that rules and items are learnt by trying them out in production.

In sharp contrast to these hypotheses, the CH claims that language is acquired unconsciously through messages we understand. Krashen (2004a) argues that "we acquire language when we understand messages, when we understand what people tell us and when we understand what we read." (p. 21).

What is of particular interest is that the CH is claimed to be applicable to literacy development, (Krashen, 2005b) its tenet being that the ability to successfully read and write in a foreign language is also the result of comprehensible

Received: 29 January 2010
Accepted: 21 May 2010

input. Comprehensible input, it is hypothesized, can help accelerate the acquisition of literacy even without formal instruction. The strict condition set for this is that the environment must be supportive and not create anxiety for the acquirers.

From these assertions, it becomes obvious that the CH is not an independent hypothesis. Indeed, most of its basic thesis is closely related to other fundamental hypotheses such as the Affective Filter Hypothesis and the Monitor Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985). These merging hypothetical perspectives are also claimed to make a significant contribution to language acquisition. Although, in a pedagogic context, most of the CH's claims are intuitively appealing, the presence of empirical research studies is called for to justify such a claim.

It is not my intent to present criticisms of the CH, nor will I dwell upon the other competing hypotheses *vis-à-vis* the CH here. Rather, my goal is to show that despite the emergence of other competing hypotheses, the CH is still robust as the core hypothesis in language acquisition studies to date. It has not yet lost its appeal, and many of its fundamental premises are still relevant to contemporary language pedagogy. It can be argued that comprehensible input is not only a necessary, but also a sufficient condition for acquisition to take place.

More specifically, I will examine what current research says about the CH in fostering the acquisition of literacy, and discuss to what extent different studies with different methodologies yield consistent results. I also include my own testimonial, as one of case histories, as evidence to further strengthens this particular hypothesis.

Drawing from the findings of the current research, I proceed to the discussion of the implications of the CH in the teaching of writing in a foreign language context. If the studies under review confirm the robustness of CH, their pedagogical implications are worth discussing.

THE COMPREHENSION HYPOTHESIS: A NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

A compelling corollary of the Comprehension Hypothesis is known as the Reading Hypothesis, a hypothesis which claims that "our reading ability, our ability to write in acceptable writing style, our spelling ability, vocabulary knowledge, and our ability to handle complex syntax is the result of reading" (Krashen, 2005b, p. 21).

The fact that the presence of comprehensible input (aural and written language) is necessary in language acquisition is indisputable. Yet, one may question whether input alone is sufficient for acquisition. This is a controversial issue.

The emergence of other contesting hypotheses, such as the Skill-Building Hypothesis and the Output Hypothesis, and more recently the Interaction Hypothesis (*see* Ellis, 1990; Gass, 1997; Swain, 1985; Ortega, 2009) implies that comprehensible input alone is not adequate. It is, as the scholars argue, necessary but insufficient condition.

In many of his publications, however, Krashen (1989: 1998: 2004c) has been consistent in his view that comprehensible input alone is sufficient for language acquisition to take place. Other hypotheses, as he argues, suffer from severe limitations: they produce only learned competence, they are based on a delayed gratification approach, and no direct evidence exists to support them.

In fact, a massive amount of evidence exists, confirming the possibility of acquiring high levels of language and literacy competence with the absence of output (Krashen, 2004c is an excellent review of this evidence).

The most recent compelling direct evidence buttressing the acquisition without language production argument is that of Mason's study. Mason (2004) conducted a study on the effect of supplementation to an extensive reading programme. Her Japanese subjects aged 18 or 19 years old were divided into three groups;

students writing summaries in Japanese, students writing summaries in English, and students writing summaries in English and having their works corrected and rewriting their summaries. Mason reported no significant difference among the three groups of EFL students, concluding that the groups writing summaries in Japanese made the greatest gains in terms of the amount gained for the time devoted to English. Mason's study showed that output and correction as a supplement to extensive reading proved to be ineffective.

STUDIES SUPPORTING THE COMPREHENSION HYPOTHESIS: A SELECTIVE REVIEW

A considerable number of published studies exist to confirm what Krashen (2004c) has called the "power of reading". This section examines what research has revealed about the Reading Hypothesis, which is believed to be an effective means of increasing literacy and language development.

An overwhelming amount of evidence from case histories, correlational studies and experimental studies abounds and has been reviewed in Krashen (2003: 2004c). All of these studies buttress the claim that recreational reading makes a tremendous contribution to reading ability, the ability to write with an acceptable writing style, vocabulary knowledge, spelling ability, and the ability to use and understand complex grammatical structures (Carson, 1998; Flahive and Bailey, 1998; Kroll, 1998; Sarig, 1998; Mason, 2004).

Here, I review the most recent additional evidence of the power of reading, showing that reading, especially free voluntary reading or recreational reading, is the most effective way of accelerating literacy development in a foreign language.

Sugiharto (2005) conducted an experiment probing the contribution of in-class reading to students' writing competence. Subjects were divided into two groups; control and experimental. The former was taught writing using a conventional method, while the latter was not. The latter was asked to read and analyze model paragraphs (expository genre) on various kinds of topics. The findings showed that the reading group, except for their language use, achieved greater gains in terms of content, organization, vocabulary, and mechanics in the post-test.

Cho (2004) reported on the efficacy of a two-hour sustained silent reading (SSR) experience among Korean elementary school teachers, few of whom did any recreational reading in English before because of a lack of access to interesting reading material. The subjects were provided with 400 children books displayed in front of the class. They chose books based on their own interests; it was, in other words, a self-selected reading experience. Cho's analysis of the data (a questionnaire and a reflective essay) revealed positive reactions to SSR, a finding that led Cho to the conclusion that self-selected reading motivates further reading and contributes to language development. Having done SSR, the teacher confessed that their abilities in reading and writing improved.

Lee (2005), in an attempt to confirm the power of reading, designed two studies with completely different methodologies. The first study was correlational in nature, attempting to examine the impact of writing apprehension, and writer's block on writing performance. Other predictors which were suspected to affect the results were also included; they were the impacts of recreational reading, writing practice, and attitudes toward reading and writing instructions. The second study was experimental, with the students divided into an extensive reading group, namely those were exposed to reading under less than optimal conditions and a group which received traditional instruction. Both of these different study designs came to a similar conclusion, i.e. recreational reading served as a powerful means of reducing writing apprehension and writer's block, and increasing the frequency of writing. This study provided the evidence by confirming the efficacy of reading with acquirers of English as a foreign language controlling for writing apprehension, writer's block, frequency of writing, and

instruction. No less important, it confirms that recreational reading in school can be effective even when conditions are less than perfect. Mason (2006) confirmed the efficacy of free voluntary reading in improving TOEFL scores. Subjects, who voluntarily engaged in a reading program, were given access to a library of graded readers. Her findings confirmed that not only could input (reading alone) help the students make improvements in their TOEFL score, but it also helped them to become autonomous language acquirers.

Another compelling study of recreational reading was done by Witton-Davies (2006). His subjects were university freshman Taiwanese students learning English as a foreign language. Using two measures of proficiency (the Advanced level of the General English Proficiency Test and a vocabulary test developed by Nation (2001)), Witton-Davies found that certain variables, such as age, extra class attendance, training under native speakers, and time spent abroad in English-speaking countries, were only weak predictors of success in learning English. Reading, however, was found to be the strongest predictor of success in foreign language learning.

Pulido (2004) reported an experimental study on the relationship between text comprehension and incidental vocabulary acquisition. Her participants were 99 native speakers of English learning Spanish. Assigning her subjects to read four contrived script-based narrative passages (two more familiar scenarios and two less familiar scenarios), Pulido found that topic familiarity was a weak predictor in incidental vocabulary acquisition. Her study demonstrated that there was a lack of significant interaction between passage comprehension and topic familiarity. In general, this study strongly supports and extends the robustness of comprehensible and comprehended input in the form of reading.

No less telling evidence is Thamrin's correlational study (2009) on the effects of pleasure reading on writing ability. Thamrin reported that her subjects (N=25), Indonesian learners of English, found a statistically significant correlation between the amount of pleasure reading and writing ability. Students who reported more reading outperformed those who did less reading in terms of the overall writing components, such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and punctuation. Based on this finding, Thamrin concluded that the amount of time spent on reading for pleasure became the strong predictor that affects her respondents' writing quality.

LIGHT READING: THE POWER OF COMIC BOOKS AND NOVELS

We are often advised that light reading, such as comic books, teen romances, teen novels, youngster magazines, and bestsellers–reading materials that both children and adolescents consume almost everyday, can hinder a child's literacy development in understanding more "serious" and demanding academic literature.

Parents especially are fearful that their children are averse to reading school textbooks, and are instead getting hooked to reading bestsellers and comic books. Meanwhile, teachers feel guilty unless they exhort students to finish reading books on science, scientific journal, and other demanding literature, as prescribed in the school curriculum.

Light reading has never found a favour in any language program in such a country as Indonesia. Children–book lovers are seldom encouraged to form a habit of reading for pleasure on their own. They are hardly given freedom to read voluntarily and choose what they like to read.

Thus, the role of light and pleasure reading in enhancing literacy development has been overlooked. Comic books, in particular, have been accused as a big hindrance in promoting heavier reading. They are often claimed to offer no academic value. In many cases, they are treated as "junk reading" that can disrupt children's interests to read academic literature (Krashen and Ujiie, 2005).

Inspiring students to read "serious" literature is indeed a worthy goal. There is nothing erroneous with any language programme aiming at imbuing students with demanding academic

texts. Yet, there is a grave mistake with the means used to achieve the goal.

Does light reading disrupt children's passion in reading more demanding literature? No. Do parents and teachers need to worry about children who have the habit of gobbling any kinds books that they find genuinely interesting and entertaining to read? They don't have to.

Evidence exists, confirming the robustness of light reading in children's literacy development. One piece of reassuring evidence comes from South Africa's Bishop Desmond Tutu's testimony. Also known as a distinguished writer and thinker, he says, "one of the things that my father did was to let me read comics. I devoured all kinds of comics. People used to say, "that's bad because it spoils your English," but in fact, letting me read comics fed my love for English and my love for reading. I supposed if he had been firm, I might not have developed this deep love for reading and for English" (quoted from *Teachers College Record,* 2005a by Krashen).

Compelling also evidence comes from research using case histories method. A mother whose sons were unmotivated to read and had to be urged, coaxed, and cajoled finally felt relieved after they engaged in reading comic books.

As for her eldest son, she testified that "… devoured what seems to tons of the things…the motivation these comics provided was absolutely phenomenal and little bit frightening. My son would snatch up a new one and, with feverish and ravenous eyes, start gobbling it whenever he was – in the car on the way home from the market, in the middle of the yard, walking down the street, at the dinner table. All his senses seemed to shut down and he became a simple visual pipeline." This mother also noted that comic reading led his son to other reading, saying that "he is far more interested now in reading Jules Verne and Ray Bradbury, books on electronics and science encyclopedias" (quoted from *Teachers College Record* 2005, by Krashen).

From these pieces of evidence, it is clear that light reading provides the background knowledge necessary for the understanding of heavier reading. The evidence also demonstrates that readers do not stay on the same genre of the same book, but continue to read more serious and demanding books – ones with completely different genres. This shows that readers gradually expand their interests in reading more.

No less important than the above evidence, light reading promotes literacy in general. This is consistent with a general hypothesis that reading more means reading better, writing better, and having more vocabularies and acquiring more complex grammatical constructions, light reading has become one of the strongest predictor of success in someone's ability in writing.

The following quote is a testimony of Tasha Stoltz, a student at Sekolah Bogor Raya, who had her writing published for the first time by *The Jakarta Post* in 2006. Aspiring to become a writer and describing herself as an avid reader of fanfiction and as a "Potteraholic", she wrote, "I also learned to love writing through fanfiction, and because of fanfiction, I look forward to writing school essays and reports, whereas previously I loathed them."

One of my students in my writing class told me recently that she learnt much in using the degree of formality in English vocabulary from comics, such as *The Adventure of Huckleberry Finn*, *The Adventure of Moby Dick*, and *Travellers on Gulliver's Island*. She also reported that she had developed a habit of reading through these comics.

Needless to say, if light reading has a tremendous effect on children's literacy development and offers a great pleasure for children so great that they acquire the language effortlessly, its inclusion in language programme at school is therefore imperative.

From language acquisition point of view, a large quantities of compelling, interesting and engaging junk reading can make a healthy 'diet' for the children to be consumed everyday.

A PERSONAL TESTIMONY

As a non-native speaker of English, I must admit that my writing competence in English results from my self-exposure to English reading

materials, which I find not only interesting and comprehensible, but also compelling, challenging and thought provoking.

Once a beginner language learner with limited proficiency, I was obsessed with light reading materials written both in Indonesian and in English. Folk tales, comics, simplified stories (horror and romance), and magazines were among the materials that became my regular diet at that time.

My teachers never assigned me to read these materials as part of my school assignments. I chose the titles of the books on my own and read them simply to fulfil my desire to read, nothing else. No rewards and incentives were offered for my reading activities. Thus, it was free voluntary reading, self-selected reading or reading for pleasure, reading done with no "accountability", no testing, no book reports, but for its own sake, for pleasure (Krashen, 2004c: 2007).

Indonesian folk-tales written in English and graded from Beginner, Intermediate to the Advanced level were especially of high interest to me, and almost everyday, I would devour them as parts of my out-class activities. So interesting, comprehensible and compelling were the stories depicted in these readings that when I read I found myself "lost in the book" and barely aware that I was reading in another language.

My passion in light reading still lingered when I studied at the university. Now having sufficient proficiency in English, I still remain a voracious reader. However, I don't remain on the same diet – reading simplified children literature. Instead, I have moved beyond it. I read more demanding literature, more serious and heavier reading.

Once a good reader, Krashen says, always a good reader. I am now an avid reader of prestigious scholarly journals such as *Applied Linguistics*, *TESOL Quarterly*, *Language Learning*, *College Composition and Communication*, *College English*, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* and *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, just to mention a few.

My exposure to reading both in English and Indonesian has had a tremendous impact on my academic career both as a teacher and researcher in Indonesia. Light reading, in particular, which I consumed, almost everyday when I was a child, has indeed had a profound effect on me. As a result of reading, I have so far produced over a hundred op-ed articles published in *The Jakarta Post* – a leading English newspaper in Jakarta, Indonesia, and have them reprinted many times in international papers like *The New Straits Times* and *The Brunei Times*. Despite having no formal training in writing in the journalism genre, I managed to publish numerous articles in this genre. Clearly, my competence in journalistic writing results from my self-exposure to reading the newspaper. This attests to Smith's (1983) hypothesis that "to learn how to write for newspaper, you must read newspapers; textbooks about them will not suffice" (p. 560). In addition, as a result of self-exposure to reading the above journals, I have acquainted myself with written conventions typical in journal writings. I have unconsciously acquired vocabulary, rhetorical structures of academic writing, complex grammatical expressions, and styles. Again, without any training in how to write a scholarly work for publications, I have been able to have my writings published in various refereed national and international journals.

One of the most plausible causes of this acquisition is that both newspaper and academic journals form narrow reading (Krashen, 2004a) – reading by focusing on one topic, author, and genre. The efficacy of narrow input in the form of narrow reading has tremendous impacts on my literacy development. Not only does it serve as important background knowledge for my understanding the content of newspapers and articles in the journal, but it also facilitates the acquisition of writing conventions, styles, grammar, and vocabulary in these different genres. Most important, narrow reading helps pave the way to the attainment of independent acquisition, the eventual goal of language acquisition theory.

This personal testimony, like other case histories presented in Krashen (2003: 2004c), clearly supports the robustness of comprehensible input in the form of free voluntary reading.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TEACHING OF WRITING

Conventional wisdom says that the best we can do to assist our students of all levels of language proficiency in developing their writing skill is to give them writing instruction, to exhort them to do more writing practice, and then to give them corrective feedback on their finished, yet often inchoative ideas on paper. In addition, conventional wisdom also tells us that teachers need to painstakingly explain complex grammar rules to their students.

Both writing instruction and the mastery of language rules, however, are of little value in helping student writers acquire writing competence. Many published studies demonstrate that the effects of instruction on students' writing are weak, fragile, and wear off over time. Other studies show that instruction has no effect at all on writing development. Writing instruction does not give students a feel of what good and acceptable writing looks like. Specifically, it does not help students acquire writing style, appropriate diction, and correct spelling (Kroll, 1998).

Increased writing frequency, either through self-sponsored writing or classroom-instructed writing, does not result in significantly increased proficiency, simply because "people do not write enough for writing to have any significant impact on literacy, given the complexity of the systems to be acquired" (Krashen, 1992, p.421).

Similarly, the mastery of the rules of grammar does not contribute to writing development. It is evident that students, who have been exposed to the teaching of grammar for many years, grappling with understanding and memorizing rules, are still unable to display competence in writing.

There is on the other compelling verification that competence in literacy can develop in the absence of instruction. In case histories reviewed in Krashen (2004c), reading alone has shown to be sufficient condition for the acquisition of literacy to take place.

Given the complexity of language and the limitation of direct instruction, a general conclusion then is that writing competence cannot effectively be acquired via writing and grammar instruction. This, however, does not imply that writing instruction is of no use and should be jettisoned from the school curriculum. There is another alternative; one that offers much better results and less tedious efforts on the part of both teachers and students.

This alternative can best be explained in terms of Krashen's (1984) dichotomy: writing *competence* and writing *performance*. The former refers to the possession of a good writing style (i.e. grammar, vocabulary, and spelling), while the latter designates the ability to write using efficient writing strategies (i.e. planning, drafting, revising, and editing), that is, to use writing to solve problems and stimulate cognitive development.

Writing instruction cannot make students competent in writing, but it can help equip students with efficient writing strategies. As these strategies are teachable, writing instruction is the key to raising students' awareness of how to compose efficiently. By contrast, writing competence can only be acquired via reading. That is, the ability to write in an acceptable manner using correct grammar, vocabulary and spelling is derived from reading, not from writing practice. It is reading, Krashen (1984) says, that "gives the writer the "feel" for the look and texture of reader-based prose" (p. 20). We clearly need to invest more time and energy helping students acquire writing competence through wide reading. Forcing students to write without sufficient competence is tantamount to forcing an engine to work without gasoline.

Although writing styles, grammar, and vocabulary are not acquired via writing, writing has different contributions. It can help us solve problems and makes you smart (Krashen, 2003: 2004b). It can also make us critical. Smith (1983, cited in Krashen, 2004c, p.133) advises us why we do not learn to write by writing:

I thought the answer [to how we learn to write] must be that we learn to write by writing until I reflected on how little anyone writes in school, even the eager students, and how little feedback is provided. No one writes enough

to learn more than a small part of what writers need to know.

It seems then that the best and the only sensible way of accelerating students' writing competence is to get students hooked on books and to make them fly to books, just as an opium smoker flies to his pipe (adapted from W. Somerset Maugham:

> "Conversation after a time bores me, games tire me, and my own thoughts, which we are told are the unfailing resource of a sensible man, have a tendency to run dry. Then I fly to my book as the opium-smoker to his pipe..." Nell, 1988, p.232).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to Stephen D. Krashen for his comments on the earlier draft of this article.

This article is a thoroughly revised version of the paper presented at ASIA TEFL International Conference, Bali, Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Carson, J.G. (1998). Reading for writing: Cognitive perspectives. In J.G. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.).

Cho, K.S. (2005). Teachers' voices in EFL teacher training: Reactions to a sustained silent reading experience. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 17-2.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Flahive, D.E. and N.H. Bailey. (1998). Exploring reading/writing relationships in adult second language learners. In J.G. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.).

Gaas, M.S. (1997). *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Krashen, S. (1984). *Writing: Research, Theory, and Applications*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1989). We acquire vocabulary and spelling by reading: Additional evidence for the Input Hypothesis. *Modern Language Journal*, *73*, 440-464.

Krashen, S. (1992). *Some new evidence for an old hypothesis*. In James E. Alatis (Ed.) (1992).

Krashen. (1998). Comprehensible output? *System*, *26*, 175-82.

Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

Krashen, S. (2004a). The case for narrow reading. *Language Magazine*, *3*(5), 17-19.

Krashen, S. (2004b). Applying the comprehension hypothesis: Some suggestions. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*, 21-29.

Krashen, S. (2004c). *The Power of Reading* (2nd Edn.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann and Westport, CONN: Libraries Unlimited.

Krashen, S. (2005a). The "Decline" of reading in America, poverty, and access to books, and the use of comics in encouraging reading. *Teachers College Record*, February.

Krashen, S. (2005b). Second language "Standard for Success": Out of touch with language acquisition. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*, 12-16.

Krashen, S. (2007). Free voluntary we-surfing. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *3*, 2-9.

Krashen, S. and Ujiie, J. (2005). Junk food is bad for you, but junk reading is good for you. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*, 5-12.

Kroll, B. (1998). Teaching writing is teaching reading: Training the new teacher of ESL composition. In J.G. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.).

Lee, S. (2005). The robustness of extensive reading: Evidence from two studies. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*, *13-19.*

Lehmann, M. (2007). Is intentional or incidental vocabulary learning more effective? *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *3*, 23-27.

Mason, B. (2004). The effect of adding supplementary writing to an extensive reading program. Can the power of reading be increased by adding supplementary writing activities? *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *1*, *2-16.*

Mason, B. (2006). Free voluntary reading and autonomy in second language acquisition: Improving TOEFL scores from reading alone. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *2, 2-5.*

Nation, P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nell, V. (1988). *Lost in a Book*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ponniah, R.J. (2008). Free voluntary reading and the acquisition of grammar by adult ESL students. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *4*, *20-22.*

Pulido, D. (2004). The relationship between text comprehension and second language incidental vocabulary acquisition: A matter of topic familiarity? *Language Learning*, *5(3)*, 469-523.

Sarig, G. (1998). Composing a study-summary: A reading/writing encounter. In J.G. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.).

Smith, F. (1983). Reading like a writer. *Language Arts*, *60*, 558-567.

Stoltz, S. (2006). Fanfiction helps aspiring young writers. *The Jakarta Post*, September 10.

Sugiharto, S. (2005). An empirical study on reading-writing connection: Research insights for the classroom. *Linguistik Indonesia*, *23*(1), 63-80.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In Gass and Madden (Eds.). (1985).

Thamrin, H.N. (2009). Effects of pleasure reading on writing competence. Undergraduate thesis. Atma Jaya Catholic University, Jakarta.

Witton-Davies, G. (2006). What does it take to acquire English? *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *2*, *2-8.*