

Vietnamese EFL Students' Perceptions and Self-reported Use of Lexical Inferencing in L2 Reading

Mai Ngoc Yen

Nam Can Tho University, Can Tho City, Vietnam

Abstract *Lexical inferencing has long been proven to play an important role in reading comprehension, specifically when it comes to strategies for dealing with unfamiliar terms in reading texts. Although much research has been done on the employment of lexical inferencing strategies in L2 reading, empirical evidence concerning the perceptions and practices of lexical inferencing strategies in Vietnamese contexts is just humble. To contribute to narrowing this gap, the current study is aimed to investigate Vietnamese EFL learners' perceptions and self-reported use of lexical inferencing strategies in reading comprehension. Data were collected from 60 English-majored students at a private university in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam through a questionnaire. The results indicated that most students perceived lexical inferencing as being of significant values in L2 reading. As for the strategies in this regard, it was found that contextual and intralingual cues were commonly used in the participants' lexical inferencing with the same level of frequency. It is suggested that more attention should be paid to lexical inferencing strategy instruction in EFL classrooms for the sake of students' learning, especially their reading comprehension performance.*

Keywords — *Lexical inferencing, lexical inferencing strategies, perceptions and practices*

I. INTRODUCTION

Reading becomes essential for the development of one's linguistic skills as well as for their learning process in general (Mikulecky, 2008). According to Qanwal & Karim (2014), reading is frequently acknowledged as an interpretive and participatory ability that entails active, cognitive thought processes in addition to decoding. In order to develop their language competency, learners can have sufficient exposure to the target language through English reading (Erten & Razi, 2003). However, due to its intricate nature, effective reading is seen to be a challenging ability to perfect. Building meaning from printed text requires a complicated, dynamic brain process called reading (Jayanti, 2016). As a result, learning to read requires a lot of practice, time, and effort (Huyen & Trang, 2020). Language reading issues are a common challenge for weak readers, given that one of the difficult aspects is a lack of vocabulary knowledge (Lili, 2014). Kaivanpanah and Moghaddam (2012) also assert interpreting the meaning of unfamiliar words becomes incredibly vital whenever one wants to grasp written materials, which is why lexical inferencing plays a major part in reading. The capacity to properly infer the meaning of unfamiliar words, or more simply, to infer the meaning of unknown words, is known as lexical inferencing. Both language and nonlinguistic information have been employed as signals in inferencing procedures. Also while learning the meaning of unfamiliar words, students employ a variety of systematic procedures in addition to their capacity for guessing (Kangwanpradit & Sappapan, 2016). Van Zealand (2014) also stated that lexical inferencing techniques are important for reading comprehension and can help EFL students comprehend the text more easily. Hence, guessing or inferencing capacity the new words is really crucial for EFL learners.

In Vietnam, reading comprehension instruction has been an indispensable part of EFL curricula. To assist students develop additional language components, such as vocabulary and grammar, it is taught in-depth. Reading is a complicated mental activity, thus in order to understand what they are reading, readers must bring and recover a variety of prior information and experiences (Huyen & Trang, 2020). The researcher of the current study's experiences indicates that she used to struggle with academic reading passages because of unfamiliar words or even misunderstood sections because of unfamiliar or even misinterpreted vocabulary. Indeed, according to research conducted by Paribakht and colleagues (1999), a substantial portion of the words were frequently ignored by students. Inferencing was used as the primary tactic for those terms they focused on (Paribakht, T. S. & Wesche, M., 1999). There were enormous studies about this problem but most of them are

about foreign EFL learners. By extension, this study focuses on Vietnamese EFL learners' lexical inferencing proficiency.

The current study is aimed to investigate EFL students' lexical inferencing in reading comprehension. Specifically, the study focuses on examining the students' perceptions of the roles of lexical inferencing and their self-perceived strategy use to guess unknown words that they encounter in English texts. It is expected that the results of this study would help aid EFL students in expanding their lexical knowledge and advancing their reading skills. As a result, the command of reading could aid EFL students in succeeding in their English studies (Alsheikh & Elhoweris, 2011) and for decades, reading has been essential to the general improvement of linguistic abilities as well as to academic performance (Al Fraidan, 2011).

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Reading comprehension

Reading comprehension is a complicated ability linking all reading skills to comprehend the text (Tavakoli & Hayati, 2011). Tavakoli & Hayati also claimed that comprehension is the nucleus of reading. That is, the primary goal of reading is to comprehend the message and significance of any given or discovered written materials. It can be said that reading comprehension is viewed as both a method of contact with a writer and its end result.

Curtis (2002 as cited in Chegeni & Tabatabaei, 2014) argues that among the many processes readers must carry out in order to maximize comprehension are skills like choosing a text's main idea, coming up with questions about its content, and summarizing passages. Additionally, a person's comprehension of texts improves with the amount of knowledge they have and apply to doing so (Guterman, 2003). Furthermore, Block and Pressley (2002) stated that it is essential to have prior knowledge of the text that is being read or understood in order to decode its meaning and comprehend it.

2.2 Lexical inferencing

2.2.1 Definitions

Lexical inferencing is a strategy used to interpret the meaning of new words by making use of surrounding cues (Nation, 1990). The lexical inferencing approach entails making educated predictions about the meaning of the unfamiliar term based on all linguistic clues, the learner's general understanding of the world, her awareness of the co-text, and her relevant linguistic expertise (Haastrup, 1991). Furthermore, it is seen as a crucial tactic since it allows for a more thorough information processing of the text and can assist in greater comprehension of the content as a whole (Wang, 2011).

A reader requires a variety of immensely adaptable processes called comprehension strategies in order to successfully comprehend what they are reading (May, 2001). Therefore, linguistic strategy studies always play a crucial role in the linguistic achievements of students (McDonough, 1995). Previous research findings have also identified a variety of lexical inference strategies and indicated partial commonalities in strategic features.

2.2.2 Lexical inferencing Strategies

a) The study conducted by De Bot et al. (1997) asserted a set of eight knowledge sources based on data from the introverted verbal protocols of 10 English as a Second Language (ESL) learners: sentence-level grammar, word morphology, punctuation, world knowledge, discourse and text, homonymy, word associations, and cognates.

b) In 1997, in the study of Paribakht and Wesche, 8 categories in guessing unfamiliar words were identified: homonymy, morphology, word associations, sentence-level grammatical knowledge, discourse knowledge, cognates, world knowledge, punctuation.

c) Schmitt (1997, as cited in Rousoulioti & Mouti, 2016) divided the strategies into 2 directions:

- Determination-based strategies: part of speech, affixes and roots, L1 cognate, available pictures or gestures (if any), textual context, bilingual dictionary, monolingual dictionary, word lists, and flashcards
- Social strategies: inquire for L1 translation, inquire for a paraphrase or synonym of the new word, inquire for the sentence with the new word, and inquire for meaning

d) Chamot and O'Malley (1990) presented the following strategies for the aspect of strategies applied to a reading task: inferencing (use immediate and extended context to guess new words); deduction (use grammar instruction to classify word forms); elaboration (use prior knowledge), transfer (recognize, use cognates)

e) Julianna's (2017) research depicted 7 types of methods to infer the word meaning: extra textual context (thematic/world knowledge), the discourse context like outside the sentence in which the word occurred, local context (sentence level), association or collocation knowledge, syntactic knowledge, visual form, phonological similarity.

f) Jelić's (2007) research was conducted with an emphasis on several major strategies:

- Analysis of grammatical cues in the unfamiliar word
- Analysis of the parts of the unfamiliar word
- Use of the meaning of the words in the same sentence
- Analysis of grammatical cues in the surrounding sentence
- Use of the meaning of the paragraph or text as a whole
- Use of background knowledge on the topic of the text

g) Nassaji (2003) further divided knowledge sources into four categories:

- Discourse knowledge: Using knowledge about the relation between or within sentences and the devices that make connections between the different parts of the text
- World knowledge: Using knowledge of the content or the topic that goes beyond what is in the text
- Morphological knowledge: Using knowledge of word formation and word structure, including word derivations, inflections, word stems, suffixes, and prefixes
- Grammatical knowledge: The usage of syntactic categories or grammatical functions such as relative clauses (a hint on how to modify a sentence), verbs, or adjectives. The usage of connectors between words or phrases, such as restatement clues, cause-and-effect clues, examples clues, and explanation clues, is a component of discourse knowledge.

This paper concentrates on two major categories of strategies, namely contextual and intralingual strategies, each of them includes several sub-strategies to clarify the main strategies following the study of Akpınar (2013).

- Contextual categories: world knowledge, local knowledge (sentence level), clues from global context (meaning), discourse knowledge, and discourse context (read sentences around the sentence that the incidental word is in).

- Intralingual categories: morphology (part of speech), morphology (stem, affixation, and compounding), syntax (grammatical knowledge), phonology/orthography (knowledge of pronunciation and spelling), and knowledge of collocation.

2.3 The relationship between lexical inferencing and reading comprehension

Students' reading comprehension was significantly impacted by the lexical inferencing method (Juliana, 2018). Students who received lexical inferential training or already possessed this skill performed better in the reading comprehension test compared to those who did not possess this skill. This highlights the significance of the ability to infer lexical meanings in improving reading-level comprehension amongst EFL students, with the exception of students who possess a wide range of vocabulary. Therefore, the research suggests that lexical inferencing can be an effective teaching method to enhance EFL students' reading comprehension ability (Hamouda, 2021). Both of these factors are interrelated and proportional to each other. If the inferential capacity is good, the reading comprehension is also quite easy, and vice versa.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research design

A quantitative research design was employed to collect data for the present study. A questionnaire was used as the main research instrument to obtain quantitative data on Vietnamese EFL students' awareness of the roles of lexical inferencing and their self-reported use of lexical inferencing strategies in reading comprehension.

3.2 Participants

A total of 60 students majoring in English studies from 3 classes at a university in the Mekong Delta of Vietnam participated in this study. The number of female participants (61.7%) was higher than that of male



participants (38.3%). Their average age was 20, and more than half of them have studied English for at least 10 years. After the quantitative data were analyzed, six participants were randomly selected to take part in a semi-structured interview on a voluntary basis.

3.3 Research instruments

The questionnaire was comprised of three sections: (1) the participants' demographic information, (2) the students' perceptions of the significance of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension, and (3) the students' perceived strategy use regarding lexical inferencing. In the first section, the participants' demographic information, including gender, age and English learning experience, was collected. Section 2 had 10 items that were designed and adapted based on the research conducted by Al-Jahwari and Al-Humaidi in 2015. To have a final version of the questionnaire, it was modified to some extent so that it could better suit the research context and aims of this study. The items in this section were presented according to a 5-point Likert scale (i.e., 1 = 'strongly disagree', 2 = 'disagree', 3 = 'neutral', 4 = 'agree', and 5 = 'strongly degree'). Section 3 was adapted from Qian's (2004) questionnaire. The third section was divided into two clusters with the goal of gathering data on the participants' perceptions toward their reported use of vocabulary inferencing strategies in reading comprehension. It included 13 rating scale items, each of which was carefully worded. Participants were asked to rate how frequently they used specific inferencing strategies to deal with unfamiliar words in English texts. A similar pattern of a 5-point Likert scale was repeated for eliciting responses to the items in this section, ranging from 1 = 'never' to 5 = 'always'.

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire	Number of items	of Items used	Contents
Section 2	10	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10	EFL students' perception of the roles of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension
Section 3	13	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23	EFL students' perceived strategy use regarding lexical inferencing.

TABLE II
SUMMARY OF LEXICAL INFERENCING STRATEGIES

Cluster (Main strategies)	Sub-strategies	Items used
Cluster 1 (Contextual strategies)	World knowledge	11, 12
	Sentence level (local context)	13
	Meaning (clues from global context)	14
	Discourse (Discourse knowledge, discourse context)	15, 16
Cluster 2 (Intralingual strategies)	Morphology (parts of speech, stem, root, affixation, compounding)	17, 18, 19, 20, 21
	Syntax (grammatical knowledge)	22
	Knowledge of collocation	23

IV. RESULTS

4.1 English-majored students' perceptions of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension

To investigate EFL students' perceptions of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension, the first ten out of the twenty-three items in the second section of the questionnaire were used. The reliability of this section was checked using the *Scale Test*. The result showed that the reliability coefficient was high ($\alpha = .945$). To check for the mean score of the students' perception of the significance of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension, the *Descriptive Statistics Test* was conducted. The results of this test were presented in Table III.

TABLE III
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF LEXICAL INFERENCE

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceptions	60	1.3	5.00	3.93	.77

The results from Table III show that the overall mean score of the participants' perceptions of the significance of lexical inferencing in reading comprehension was 3.93, the accepted mean for the high level of perceptions ($M = 3.93$, $SD = 0.7$). To compare the mean score and the test values 3.5 and 4.5, the *One Sample T-test* was used. The results indicated that the total mean score was significantly different from 3.5 ($t = 4.342$, $df = 59$, $p = .000$) and from 4.5 ($t = -5.755$, $df = 59$, $p = .000$). Therefore, it could be concluded that English-majored students perceived lexical inferencing as "important" in reading comprehension. In other words, they recognized the importance of lexical inferencing in dealing with unfamiliar vocabulary when reading English texts.

4.2 English-majored students' perceived use of lexical inferencing strategies

The present section is geared toward English-majored students' self-report on their use of strategies to infer the meanings of words in English texts. The focus of this section was placed on two clusters identified in the third section of the questionnaire (i.e., contextual and intralingual strategies), which represent two main types of lexical inferencing strategies. The reliability of the two clusters was checked by calculating Cronbach's alpha. The results showed that both clusters had a high level of reliability coefficient ($\alpha=0.87$ for contextual strategies and $\alpha=0.92$ for intralingual strategies).

The descriptive statistics of the results on the students' self-reported use of lexical inferencing strategies are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR STRATEGY USE

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Perceptions of strategy use	60	1.92	5.00	3.81	.75

According to Table IV, the mean score of the participants' perceptions of their use of lexical inferencing strategies was 3.81 ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.74$), the accepted mean for the high level. The *One Sample T-Test* was computed to compare the mean score and the test values 3.5 and 4.5, which denote the medium and very high levels respectively. The results showed that the mean score significantly differed from 3.5 ($t = 3.186$, $df = 59$, $p = .002$) and from 4.5 ($t = -7.211$, $df = 59$, $p = .000$). This could be interpreted that the level at which English majored students reported using lexical inferencing strategies was high.

The mean scores for the two clusters of lexical inferencing strategies were also calculated by using the *Descriptive Statistics Test*. The results of this test are displayed in Table V.

TABLE V
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR THE STUDENTS' PERCEIVED USE OF THE TWO CLUSTERS OF LEXICAL INFERENCE STRATEGIES

Variables	N	Mean score	Std Deviation
Contextual	60	3.78	.76
Intralingual	60	3.82	.82

As can be seen from Table V, the mean score for contextual inferencing strategies was 3.78 ($M=3.78$, $SD=.76$) and that for intralingual inferencing strategies was 3.82 ($M=3.82$, $SD=.82$). To find out which cluster of vocabulary inferencing strategies was reported to be used more frequently by the students in reading comprehension, the two mean scores were compared by employing the *Paired Sample T-Test*. The result indicated that there was not a significant difference between them ($t = -.448$, $df = 59$, $p = .656$). This could be inferred that the students employed both intralingual and contextual strategies to guess the meanings of new words that they encountered in English texts with the same level of frequency.

To provide detailed information on the students' perceptions about their use of specific strategies, the statistical results for each item, including the mean score and the percentage, are presented in Table VI and Table VII.

TABLE VI
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF
SPECIFIC INTRALINGUAL STRATEGIES

Items	N	Mean	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always
17. I guess the meaning of a compound word by dividing each part of it.	60	3.78	1.67	8.3	28.3	33.3	28.3
18. I guess the meaning of a blend word based on its two parts as clipped words that combine with each other.	60	3.67	3.3	10.0	28.3	33.3	25.0
19. I guess the word meaning based on its prefix or suffix.	60	3.85	1.67	8.3	20.0	43.3	26.67
20. I guess the word meaning by its stem or root.	60	3.70	5.0	6.67	25.0	40.0	23.3
21. I guess the word meaning based on its part of speech.	60	4.00	1.67	6.67	16.67	40.0	35.0
22. I look for grammatical clues in surrounding sentences to help me guess the meaning of the unknown word.	60	3.82	6.67	1.67	16.67	53.3	21.67
23. I make use of other expressions that go with the unfamiliar word.	60	3.93	0.0	6.67	20.0	46.67	26.67

It can be seen from Table VI that intralingual strategies were perceived to be used frequently by the participants to infer lexical meanings in reading comprehension as the mean scores for those specific strategies ranged from 3.67 to 4.0, the accepted means for the high level of practices. As regards the students' self-report on their use of each specific strategy, the total rates of 'usually' and 'always' responses were calculated for interpreting the results. In detail, the highest percentage of the students (75%) stated that they inferred meanings of new words based on their knowledge of parts of speech (M=4.0), which was followed closely by that of the participants (74.97%) who perceived that they guessed lexical meanings by looking for grammatical clues in surrounding sentences (M=3.82). Also, approximately 70% assumed to guess the meaning of an unfamiliar word by looking at other expressions that go with it (M=3.93) and by taking into consideration its prefix or suffix (M=3.85). When it comes to compound and blend words, with lower levels of frequency, the students reported inferring lexical meanings by analyzing two separate parts of new words (M=3.78 and M=3.67 respectively).

TABLE VII
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS
CONTEXTUAL STRATEGIES

Items	N	Mean score	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always
11. I use my background knowledge of the topic of the text to guess the meaning of the unknown word.	60	3.90	1.67	6.67	21.67	40.0	30.0
12. I use the knowledge of the content or the topic that goes beyond what is in the text.	60	3.58	1.67	8.3	38.3	33.3	18.3
13. I use the meaning of other words in the same	60	3.97	0.0	6.67	18.3	46.67	28.3

Items	N	Mean score	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Usually	Always
sentence to help me guess the meaning of the unknown word.							
14. I make use of the meaning of the paragraph or text as a whole to guess the meaning of the unknown word.	60	3.65	6.67	8.3	23.3	36.67	25
15. I use the knowledge about the relation between or within sentences and devices that make a connection between the different parts of the text.	60	3.80	0.0	11.67	23.3	38.3	26.67
16. I examine the specific parts of the text other than the sentence containing the unknown word, for instance, the sentence immediately following it.	60	3.83	1.67	8.3	23.3	38.3	28.33

As indicated in Table VII, the students assumed to use contextual strategies at the high level of frequency as the mean scores for all the observed items were high, ranging from 3.58 to 3.97. Based on this result, the combined percentages for 'usually' and 'always' responses were calculated to analyze the students' perceived use of each specific contextual strategy. To be more specific, using the meaning of other words in the same sentence to guess the meaning of an unknown word was the most popular strategy among the participants (74.97%, M=3.97). The second most frequently used strategy was using background knowledge of the topic of the text to guess the meaning of an unknown word (70%, M=3.90). Another three strategies that were also common among the participants, despite with lower levels of frequency, were making use of the meaning of the paragraph or text as a whole (61.67%, M=3.65), using the knowledge about the relation between or within sentences and devices that make connection between the different parts of the text (64.97%, M=3.80), examining the specific parts of the text other than the sentence containing the unknown word (66.63%, M=3.83)

V. CONCLUSION

Lexical inferencing plays a significant role in reading since it is crucial to understand the meaning of unknown words anytime one wishes to understand written materials (Kaivanpanah and Moghaddam, 2012), specifically when it comes to strategies for dealing with incidental and/or unfamiliar terms in reading texts. Research results show that the students also have a high awareness of the importance of inferencing ability. Most of the participants believe that lexical inference helps them understand the text better, read the text faster, and based on many encounters with interpretable unfamiliar words, they can effectively expand their vocabulary. Research on vocabulary inferencing strategies has also yielded positive results. The students are aware of the use of lexical inference strategies at a "high" level. The students employed well in both two groups of strategy, intralingual and contextual strategies. In fact, students employed a variety of inferencing techniques, demonstrating that they substantially rely on this knowledge when inferring word meanings from context and that it serves as the basis for their assessments. That means whether it is an intralingual or contextual strategy, they can employ it with the same frequency, depending on the purpose of each text, they evaluate and select the appropriate strategy. However, this study is still limited in the number of participants, it is difficult to represent all Vietnamese students, and the research results are only in the students' perception. Therefore, an empirical investigation with an extensive sample is worth conducting.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Mai Ngoc Yen is a novice researcher studying and working as an apprentice at Center for training graduate performance standards and human resource development. Her research includes English learning strategies and applied linguistics.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akpınar, K. D. (2013). Lexical inferencing: perceptions and actual behaviours of Turkish English as a Foreign Language Learners' handling of unknown vocabulary. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3), 1-17.
- [2] Al Fraidan, A. A. (2010). *Test-taking strategies of EFL Saudi university level learners on two varieties of gap-filling vocabulary achievement tests* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Essex).
- [3] Al-Jahwari, Y., & Al-Humaidi, S. (2015). Prior knowledge in EFL reading comprehension: Omani teachers' perspectives & classroom strategies. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 4(1), 169-181.
- [4] Alsheikh, N. & Elhoweris, H. (2011). United Arab Emirates (UAE) high school students' motivation to read in English as a foreign language. *International Journal of Language Studies (IJLS)*, 5, 4, 53-68
- [5] Block, C. C., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Comprehension instruction: Research-based bestpractices*. New York: Guilford.
- [6] Buslon, J., & Alieto, E. (2019). Lexical inferencing strategies and reading comprehension in English: A case of ESL third graders. *Asian EFL*, 22(1), 73-94.
- [7] Chegeni, N., & Tabatabaei, O. (2014). Lexical Inferencing: The Relationship between Number and Density of Lexical Items and L2 Learners' Reading Comprehension Achievement. *Journal of Language Teaching & Research*, 5(2).
- [8] Curtis, M. (2002). Adolescent reading: A synthesis of research, adolescent literacy – research informing practice: A series of workshops. National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Retrieved 2013 from: <http://216.26.160.105/conf/nichd/synthesis.asp>.
- [9] De Bot, K., Paribakht, T. S., & Wesche, M. B. (1997). Toward A Lexical Processing Model For The Study Of Second Language Vocabulary Acquisition: Evidence from ESL Reading. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(3), 309–329.
- [10] Erten, I. H. & Razi, S. (2003). An experimental investigation into the impact of cultural schemata on reading comprehension. In *2nd International Balkan ELT Conference*, 20-22 June 2003, Trakya University, Edirne, Turkey.
- [11] Gu, P. Y., & Johnson, R. K. (1996). Vocabulary learning strategies and language learning outcomes. *Language learning*, 46, 643-697.
- [12] Guterman, E. (2003). Integrating written metacognitive awareness guidance as a 'psychological tool' to improve student performance. *Learning and Instruction*, 13(6), 633–651
- [13] Haastrup, K. (1991). *Lexical inferencing procedures, or, talking about words: Receptive procedures in foreign language learning with special reference to English* (Vol. 14). Gunter Narr Verlag.
- [14] Hamouda, Arafat. (2021), The Effect of Lexical Inference Strategy Instruction on Saudi EFL learners' Reading Comprehension. In: *Education Quarterly Reviews*, Vol.4, No.1, 96-112.
- [15] Hu, H. C. M., & Nassaji, H. (2014). Lexical inferencing strategies: The case of successful versus less successful inferencers. *System*, 45, 27-38.
- [16] Huyen, T. T. N., & Trang, N. H. (2020). EFL teachers' perceptions towards schema activation in English reading comprehension.
- [17] Jayanti, F. G. (2016). Reading difficulties comparison on students' and teachers' perception. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 4(1), 296-301.
- [18] Jelić, A. B. (2007). Lexical inferencing strategy use by Croatian foreign-language learners. *UPRT*, 245-254.
- [19] Juliana, J. (2018). The effect of lexical inferencing strategies on students' reading comprehension. *Journal MELT (medium for english language teaching)*, 1(2), 126-143.
- [20] Kaivanpanah, S. & Moghaddam, M.S. (2012). Knowledge sources in EFL learners' lexical inferencing across reading proficiency levels. *RELC Journal*, 43 (3), 373 – 391
- [21] Kangwanpradit, K., & Sappapan, P. (2016). The use of Thai EFL postgraduates' lexical inferencing strategies through the think-aloud method. *Unpublished master's thesis. Thammasat University*. Nhh
- [22] Lili, Z. (2014). A Discussion of Linguistic Factors Relating to English. Reading for Chinese Mongolian Students. *Studies in Literature and Language*
- [23] May, F. (2001). *Unraveling the Seven Myths of Reading. Assessment and Intervention Practices for Counteracting their Effects*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 107-139
- [24] McDonough, S. H. (1995). *Strategies and Skills in Learning a Foreign Language*. Edward Arnold.
- [25] Mikulecky, B.S. 2008. *Teaching Reading in a Second Language*. San Fransisco: Pearson Education.

-
- [26] Nassaji H 2003. L2 vocabulary learning from context: strategies, knowledge, sources, and their relationship with success in L2 lexical inferencing. *TESOL Quarterly*
- [27] Nation, P. (1990). Teaching and learning vocabulary. *New York: Heinle & Heinle*
- [28] O'malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge university press.
- [29] Oxford, R. L., & Scarcella, R. C. (1994). Second language vocabulary learning among adults: State of the art in vocabulary instruction. *System*, 22(2), 231–243.
- [30] Paribakht, T. S. & Wesche, M. (1999). Reading and incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition: An introspective study of lexical inferencing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*.
- [31] Qanwal, S., & Karim, S. (2014). Identifying correlation between reading strategies instruction and L2 text comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(5), 1019-1032.
- [32] Qian, D. D. (2004). Second language lexical interference: Preferences, perceptions, and practices. In P. Bogards & B. Laufer (Eds.), *Vocabulary in a second language* (pp. 155-169). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [33] Qian, D. D. (2005). Demystifying lexical inferencing: The role of aspects of vocabulary knowledge. *TESL Canada Journal*, 34-54.
- [34] Rousoulioti, T., & Mouti, A. (2016). Dealing with unknown words in L2 reading: vocabulary discovery and lexical inferencing strategies. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 18(1), 56-70.
- [35] Schmitt N. & McCarthy M., 1997. *Vocabulary: Description, Acquisition and Pedagogy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- [36] Tavakoli, M. & Hayati, S. (2011). The relationship between lexical inferencing strategies and L2 proficiency of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2 (6), 1227 - 1237. doi:10.4304/jltr.2.6.1227-1237.
- [37] Van Zealand, H. (2014). Lexical inferencing in first and second language listening. *The Modern Language Journal*, 98(4), 1006-1021. DOI: 10.1111/modl.12152.
- [38] Wang, Q. (2011). Lexical inferencing strategies for dealing with unknown words in reading-A contrastive study between Filipino graduate students and Chinese graduate students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2 (2), 302-313.
- [39] Yousefi, M. H., & Ahadzadeh, M. (2017). Iranian intermediate EFL learners' vocabulary inferencing strategies: A qualitative study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(7), 533.