



English Oral and Written Receptive Skills of Vocational Lecturers

Tuti Hartani^{1*}, Eric Sulindra² Ester Widawati Tedjo³ Susana Teopilus⁴ 

^{1,2,3}Vocational Faculty, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia, ⁴English Department, Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received August 04, 2022

Revised August 05, 2022

Accepted October 28, 2022

Available online November 25, 2022

Kata Kunci :

Kinerja mendengarkan, kinerja membaca, keterampilan reseptif, subskills

Keywords:

Listening performance, reading performance, receptive skills, subskills



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.

Copyright ©2022 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha

ABSTRAK

Membaca dan mendengarkan sebagai keterampilan reseptif telah diselidiki dari berbagai sudut. Penelitian yang dilakukan saat ini adalah penelitian deskriptif yang bertujuan untuk menemukan korelasi antara kedua keterampilan reseptif tersebut. Selain itu, menyelidiki kekuatan dan kelemahan dalam empat sub-keterampilan (menemukan ide utama, menjawab pertanyaan detail yang dinyatakan, menjawab pertanyaan detail tersirat, dan mengidentifikasi makna ungkapan yang digunakan dalam wacana lisan atau tulisan) yang dilakukan oleh responden yang dikelompokkan menjadi yang berprestasi tinggi dan yang berprestasi rendah. Temuan penelitian mengkonfirmasi korelasi positif yang signifikan antara keterampilan membaca dan mendengarkan. Dalam tes mendengarkan, mereka yang berprestasi tinggi memiliki kekuatan di semua sub-keterampilan, sedangkan kinerja yang berprestasi rendah di semua sub-keterampilan di bawah 50%, yang menyiratkan bahwa mereka memiliki kelemahan di semua sub-keterampilan mendengarkan. Dalam tes membaca, siswa yang berprestasi tinggi memiliki kekuatan di semua subskill. Siswa yang berprestasi rendah menunjukkan kinerja membaca yang kuat dalam subskill menemukan gagasan utama dan menjawab pertanyaan yang dinyatakan secara detail. Pada saat yang sama, mereka memiliki kelemahan pada subskill menjawab pertanyaan detail tersirat dan mengidentifikasi makna ungkapan yang digunakan dalam wacana tertulis. Hasil ini menyiratkan bahwa kosakata adalah faktor yang paling penting untuk ditingkatkan untuk mengantisipasi kelemahan subskill menjawab pertanyaan tersirat-detail dan mengidentifikasi makna ungkapan yang digunakan dalam wacana tertulis.

ABSTRACT

Reading and listening as receptive skills have been investigated from multiple angles. The current research is a descriptive study aiming to find the correlation between the two receptive skills. In addition, it investigates the strengths and weaknesses in terms of four subskills (finding the main idea, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in an oral or written discourse) performed by the respondents who were grouped as the high achievers and the low achievers. The research findings confirmed a significantly positive correlation between reading and listening skills. In the listening test, the high achievers had strengths in all of the subskills, whereas the low achievers' performance in all the subskills was below 50%, which implied that they had weaknesses in all of the listening subskills. In the reading test, the high achievers had strengths in all subskills. The low achievers showed strong reading performance in the subskills of finding main ideas and answering stated-detail questions. At the same time, they had weaknesses in the subskills of answering implied-detail questions and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse. This result implies that vocabulary is the most important factor to upgrade to anticipate the weakness in the subskills of answering implied-detail questions and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse.

1. INTRODUCTION

Technological advancements have made it possible to develop knowledge and skills with almost no time and space limit. It can generally be achieved well when someone is proficient in English since English is the most used language globally. Many online and offline resources are available for professional development for anyone, and most of them are in English. At the university level, lecturers are also obliged to develop themselves professionally. To do so, they attend professional events, such as seminars and conferences, as either participants or presenters. Many also take professional development courses to reach higher degrees. These lecturers must possess sufficient English proficiency in all four productive and receptive language skills. Reading and listening skills deal with receiving and understanding information, and they are called receptive skills.

*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: tuti@ukwms.ac.id (Tuti Hartani)

On the other hand, speaking and writing skills handle the process of producing the language and are known as productive skills. Receptive skills and productive skills have their important. One of the reasons why receptive skills are important is that they can open many career opportunities. In the engineering field, stresses that engineering students should possess adequate receptive skills for their professional and pragmatic excellence, as a lack of receptive skills may ruin the understanding and comprehensibility of the content. As reading and listening are receptive skills, they are believed to share the same features in learning and acquisition. These two language skills rely heavily upon the predictive process (Chang, 2009; Diakidoy et al., 2005; Meyer et al., 2016; Tschirner, 2016), and they are also processed in the same part of the human brain (Dunlosky & Bjork, 2013; Mankinen et al., 2015). Both reading and listening comprehension were also found to have shared the same linguistic contributors (Wolf et al., 2019). Therefore, the factors which can improve reading comprehension will also improve listening comprehension.

Various studies have been conducted regarding the relationships between reading and listening in EFL (English as Foreign Language). There are some correlational studies about listening and reading, how they interact, and the connection between them. The correlation between reading and listening is quite strong (Safitri et al., 2021; Sapoetra, 2017; Vidal, 2011). Some studies concern the supporting contributors in listening and reading comprehension. Vocabulary and word reading fluency contribute to listening comprehension and reading comprehension (Wolf et al., 2019). Similarly, some studies claimed that vocabulary was the main input factor in listening and reading comprehension (Safitri et al., 2021; van Zeeland & Schmitt, 2013; Zhang & Zhang, 2020). Meanwhile, word decoding, which is closely related to word fluency, was significant in listening and reading comprehension for higher levels of learners (Diakidoy et al., 2005; Hogan et al., 2014). The relationship between L2 vocabulary knowledge (VK) and second-language (L2) listening and reading comprehension, argued that vocabulary knowledge had a very important role in L2 listening and reading comprehension (Zhang & Zhang, 2020). Further, they emphasized the need for sufficient vocabulary coverage for unassisted listening and reading comprehension. Another crucial contributor to listening and reading comprehension is background knowledge or schemata (Ekasary et al., 2022; Hashemian & Fadaei, 2013; Wang, 2018). In listening and reading, background knowledge connects visual information and prior knowledge to understand a text. Therefore, listeners or readers should have prior knowledge relevant to the text topic to have proper comprehension.

Effective listening and reading comprehension rely heavily on cognitive processes. These processes can broadly be categorized into the phonological process for word recognition, the syntactic process for grammar recognition, the semantic process for meaning identification, and working memory for storing and retrieving information. During the cognitive processes of comprehending a text, the listener or reader constantly makes predictions focused on the oral or written text. Using the predictive processes, the listener or reader can refine, revise, and verify his predictions on the text's meaning (Sonia & Fisher, 2016). In so doing, the listener or reader connects his prior knowledge to the text. The predictive process can work optimally in context at the sentence or discourse level. If words are in isolation, this predictive process will not function maximally. In line with the previous studies on reading and listening comprehension, it can be concluded that four subskills act as comprehension skills indicators. These four subskills are finding the main ideas of the discourse, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions in the discourse. These four subskills of comprehension are similar to those used by some previous studies (Duke & Pearson, 2009; Kirana, 2022).

In addition to these four comprehension subskills, organization of ideas, reference, specific information, and transition (Nurhayati & Nehe, 2016). Previous study who dealt with test-taking strategies in answering the TOEFL reading comprehension section listed thirteen subskills in comprehension questions (Zulmaini, 2021). The thirteen subskills are: answering main idea questions, recognizing the organization of ideas, answering stated-detail questions, finding "unstated" detail questions, finding pronoun referents, answering implied-detail questions, answering transition questions, finding definitions from structural clues, determining meanings from word parts, using context to determine meanings of difficult words, using context to determine meanings of simple words, determining where specific information is found, and determining the to be, purpose, or course. These various subskills can be categorized into four major comprehension subskills: finding the main ideas of the discourse, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions in the discourse. For instance, the subskills of reference, transition, and finding definitions from structural clues can be referred to as answering implied-detail questions. The subskills of determining meanings from word parts, using context to determine meanings of difficult words, and using context to determine meanings of simple words (Zulmaini, 2021), can be classified into the subskill of

identifying the meaning of the expressions in the discourse. Thus, the present study classifies comprehension subskills into four comprehension subskills mentioned above. The present research deals with twenty-six Indonesian vocational lecturers planning to take their doctorate for professional development. It investigates the relationship between listening and reading comprehension skills. In addition, it examines the strengths and weaknesses of the high and low achievers in terms of the four receptive subskills: finding main ideas, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in an oral or written discourse. The research results are expected to give insights into teaching and learning English as a foreign language, especially in listening and reading comprehension. The insights are expected to be related to which area of language learning is the most significant to improve about the most affected shared subskills (or shared contributors) in listening and reading comprehension. By identifying the most affected subskills, some recommendations to improve reading comprehension and listening comprehension skills can be given to the vocational lecturers who wish to upgrade their English proficiency skills.

2. METHODS

This research, which is part of a larger study entitled *The Mapping of English Language Proficiency of Vocational Lecturers Who Are Candidates for Doctorate Students* by the same authors, is a descriptive study. It focuses on investigating the respondents' receptive skills, namely listening and reading, in English as a foreign language and finding the relationships between the two receptive skills. In addition, the study examines the strengths of the high achievers and those of the low achievers in terms of the four receptive subskills. The respondents are 26 vocational lecturers between 26 and 47 years old who plan to pursue a doctor's degree in 2022–2026. They registered themselves to be the research respondents. The lecturers teach in Indonesian vocational tertiary education located in 10 provinces in Java, Kalimantan, Sulawesi, Sumatera, and Nusa Tenggara islands. They major in information technology, electronics, accounting, management, tourism, administration, neurorehabilitation, nursing, pharmacy, or chemistry.

Taking the paper-based TOEFL model, an English proficiency test was used to measure the respondents' English proficiency. This test consists of three sections: listening comprehension, structure, written expression, and reading comprehension. The study used the results of the Listening Comprehension section and the Reading Comprehension section, or the first and third sections of the English proficiency test, respectively, to indicate the respondents' English receptive skills. The Listening Comprehension test has three parts. Part A is Short Conversation, containing 30 short conversations, each followed by a question. Part B is Long Conversation which contains two long conversations with four questions for each conversation. In part C, Short Talk, there are three talks, and four questions follow each talk. Thus, the Listening Comprehension test consists of 50 items altogether. The internal reliability of the Listening Comprehension test is 0.88. Table 1 illustrates the categorization of the 50 Listening Comprehension questions into the four receptive subskills.

Table 1. Receptive Subskill Categorization of Listening Comprehension Questions

No.	Subskills	Item Number
1	Finding Main Idea	31, 39, 44, 47
2	Answering Stated-detail Questions	40, 41, 42, 45, 50
3	Answering Implied-detail Question	1, 4, 9, 11, 13, 17, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 43, 46, 48, 49
4	Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 29

The Reading Comprehension test contains five texts ranging from 153 – 245 words in length, and ten questions accompany each text. The total 50 Reading Comprehension items are also classified into the same four subskills, as shown in Table 2. The internal reliability of the Reading Comprehension test is .81.

Table 2. Receptive Subskill Categorization of Reading Comprehension Questions

No.	Subskills	Item Number
1	Finding Main Idea	2, 29, 33
2	Answering Stated-detail Questions	4, 6, 7, 12, 14, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 40, 42, 44, 39, 41, 47, 49
3	Answering Implied-detail Question	9, 10, 13, 15, 19, 26, 34, 36, 37, 46, 48, 50, 3, 27, 43
4	Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	1, 5, 8, 18, 11, 24, 25, 28, 35, 38, 45

The English proficiency test was conducted online using google-forms. The Listening Comprehension section took 35 minutes, and the audio was played only once, whereas 55 minutes was allocated for the Reading Comprehension section. The respondents answered the test questions by clicking the option they chose. Each correct answer was assigned one point, and the total scores of the Listening Comprehension and Reading Comprehension sections were counted to reflect the respondents' English performance in Listening and Reading comprehension. Finally, the overall scores of the English proficiency test were calculated by adding the total scores of the three sections (Listening Comprehension, Structure and Written Expression, and Reading Comprehension). The respondents were grouped into high and low achievers based on their overall scores. After the total scores of the Listening Comprehension and Reading Comprehension tests were counted, the Pearson correlation was applied using SPSS 28.0 to determine whether there was a significant relationship between the respondents' oral and written receptive skills. Then, the quartiles of the English proficiency test were calculated. The respondents who got lower than the 25th percentile were identified as low achievers, and those whose scores were equal to or higher than the 75th percentile were labeled high achievers. Based on the grouping, a qualitative analysis was conducted to reveal the strengths of the high and low achievers in the four receptive subskills.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

Table 3 shows that the result of the Pearson Correlation yields a significant correlation coefficient of 0.785. This figure indicates that the respondent who scores high in reading comprehension would also score high in listening comprehension and vice versa.

Table 3. Correlation between the Respondents' Oral and Written Receptive Skills

Variable	Statistics	Listening	Reading
Listening	Pearson Correlation	1	0.785
	Sig. (2-tailed)		<0.001
Reading	Pearson Correlation	0.785	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	<0.001	

This finding supported the research results which show that relationship between listening and reading could be due to the nature of listening and reading (Magfirah, 2018; Safitri et al., 2021; Sapoetra, 2017). The respondents were operating similar processes in their minds while working on the listening and reading test. This finding was in line with the research results which pointed out that comprehension processes required internal conceptualization, memory retention, and word recognition (Hastuti, 2019; Marchetti, 2014; Palmer, 2012; Wolf et al., 2019). Table 4 summarizes the respondents' performance in the four subskills: finding the main idea, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions in oral or written discourse. The respondents generally showed the same rank order of performance in reading, whereas they indicated a slightly different rank order in listening performance regarding the four subskills.

Table 4. Respondents' Performance in Four Oral and Written Receptive Subskills

Listening Subskills	Percentage of Correct Answer													
	High Achievers						Low chiever							
	H-1	H-2	H-3	H-4	H-5	H-6	Average	L-1	L-2	L-3	L-4	L-5	L-6	Average
Finding	10	50	75	10	10	10	88	50	75	50	25	50	25	46
Main Ideas	0			0	0	0								
Answering Stated-detail Questions	10	60	80	20	60	80	67	20	40	20	20	40	40	30
Answering Implied-detail Question	92	88	88	96	83	83	88	25	38	29	58	25	29	34

Listening Subskills	Percentage of Correct Answer													
	High Achievers							Low chiever						
	H-1	H-2	H-3	H-4	H-5	H-6	Average	L-1	L-2	L-3	L-4	L-5	L-6	Average
Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	94	76	82	94	88	88	87	35	24	24	35	47	29	32
Reading Subskills	Percentage of Correct Answer													
	High Achievers							Low chiever						
	H-1	H-2	H-3	H-4	H-5	H-6	Average	L-1	L-2	L-3	L-4	L-5	L-6	Average
Finding Main Ideas	10	10	10	10	10	67	94	67	10	33	67	67	33	61
Answering Stated-detail Questions	81	95	86	95	81	86	87	57	52	48	43	81	62	57
Answering Implied-detail Question	80	80	80	87	80	67	79	50	50	43	43	86	50	50
Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	82	73	82	82	73	64	76	45	36	18	45	45	27	36

Though the respondents' performance in listening and reading tests correlated positively and significantly, the test results showed a completely different pattern of the rank order of subskill performance for the high achievers and a slightly different pattern for the low achievers.

Table 5. Ranks of High-Achievers' Listening and Reading Subskill Performance

No.	Subskills	Listening		Reading	
		Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage
1	Finding Main Idea	1-2	88%	1	94%
2	Answering Stated-detail Questions	4	67%	2	87%
3	Answering Implied-detail Question	1-2	88%	3	79%
4	Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	3	87%	4	76%

Note: 1-2 means rank 1 and rank 2.

Table 5 shows the ranks of listening and reading subskill performance of the high achievers. In the listening test, the order of subskill performance is as follows: finding main ideas, answering implied-detail questions, identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse, and answering stated-detail questions. In reading, the rank of subskills is finding main ideas, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse. These findings reveal a difference between oral and written receptive skills. In the listening process, the respondents could not re-listen to the oral texts, and they had to rely on their attentional and memory skills; on the other hand, in the reading process, the respondents could reread the text while working on the reading comprehension test (Wolf et al., 2019).

Table 6. Ranks of Low-Achievers' Listening and Reading Subskill Performance

No.	Subskills	Listening		Reading	
		Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage
1	Finding Main Idea	1	46%	1	61%
2	Answering Stated-detail Questions	4	30%	2	57%
3	Answering Implied-detail Question	2	34%	3	50%
4	Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	3	32%	4	36%

Table 6 shows the ranks of listening and reading subskill performance of the low achievers. In the listening test, the order of subskill performance is as follows: finding main ideas, answering implied-detail questions, identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse, and answering stated-detail questions. In reading, the rank of subskills is finding main ideas, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse. Similar to the high achievers' performance in listening and reading, the findings of the low achievers' performance also reflect the different nature between the oral and written receptive skills. As a result, the low achievers' performance on the reading test is higher than on the listening test. Having the benefit of rereading the written texts, they could scan for finding the correct answers to the stated-detail questions. This fact explains the biggest difference (27%) in the subskill achievement of answering stated-detail questions between the reading and listening tests. The smallest difference in the subskill achievement (4%) lies in identifying the meaning of the discourse's expressions. It might indicate that these respondents, whose low English language proficiency, had very limited lexical knowledge or vocabulary repertoire (Sheth, 2015; Zhang & Zhang, 2020). Their predictive process did not work optimally either.

Another worth-noted finding related to the low achievers' performance in listening and reading subskills is concerning finding the main ideas. Although this subskill ranked first in the listening and reading tests of the low achievers, they got less than 50% in the listening test, while their achievement in reading for the same subskill was 61%. As shown in Table 7, the listening subskill rank order between the high and low achievers is slightly different. For the high achievers, answering implied-detailed questions and finding main ideas occupy the first and second places as reflected by the percentage of the correct answers (88% for each subskill), followed by identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse (87%) and answering stated-detailed questions (67%). For the low achievers, the first rank is finding main ideas (46%), next answering implied-detailed questions (34%), identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse (32%), and finally answering stated-detailed questions (30%).

Table 7. Ranks of Listening Subskill Performance

No.	Subskills	Listening		Reading	
		Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage
1	Finding Main Idea	1-2	88%	1	94%
2	Answering Stated-detail Questions	4	67%	2	87%
3	Answering Implied-detail Question	1-2	88%	3	79%
4	Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	3	87%	4	76%

In the listening process, the ability to find the main ideas and answer implied-detail questions of an oral text indicates a person's comprehension level. It reflects the internal conceptualization process in which a listener forms a general idea at the sentence or discourse level. The findings reveal that both the high achievers and the low achievers perform better in finding main ideas and answering implied-detail questions than the other two subskills. A possible explanation for why the respondents performed lower in the other two subskills relates to memory retention. The role of memory retention is crucial for the subskill of answering stated-detail questions and of identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse. In the listening process, memory retention can be easily distracted, resulting in the inability to answer the related questions correctly. This fact might happen to the respondents while doing the listening test. Particularly, when dealing with test questions related to the stated information, such as names, places, time, and events, the respondents had to recall what they had listened to; nevertheless, they had neither written texts to refer back to nor control of the input (Chang, 2009). Therefore,

answering stated-detail questions was the lowest subskill performed by both the high and low achievers in listening comprehension.

Despite the same pattern of subskill rank order in the listening performance of the high achievers and low achievers, the test results indicated a sharp difference in their achievement. For example, regarding the subskill of finding main ideas, the high achievers answered 88% of the questions correctly, while the low achievers got only 46% correctly. It also applies to the other three subskills, where the low achievers reached less than half of the high achievers' performance. Table 8 indicates that the reading subskill rank order between the high and low achievers is the same. For both the high and the low achievers, the first rank goes to finding main ideas, answering stated-detail questions, the second, the implied-detail questions, the third, and finally, identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse.

Table 8. Ranks of Reading Subskill Performance

No.	Subskills	Listening		Reading	
		Rank	Percentage	Rank	Percentage
1	Finding Main Idea	1	94%	1	61%
2	Answering Stated-detail Questions	2	87%	2	57%
3	Answering Implied-detail Question	3	79%	3	50%
4	Identifying Meaning of the Expressions Used in Oral Discourse	4	79%	4	36%

Discussion

Subskill rank order is likely due to the nature of reading comprehension: to understand a written discourse, a reader needs background knowledge and vocabulary related to the reading topic (Magfirah, 2018). A reader needs to dig out a piece of information from his large cognitive database (collected from memory retention on information) to create more detailed comprehension (Francois Le Ny & Kintsch, 1982); therefore, the more a reader has background knowledge and vocabulary on the reading topic, the better his comprehension is. The research finding proves that the respondents performed the highest in answering the questions related to finding main ideas, as stated in Table 8, 94% for the high achievers and 61% for the low achievers. This finding implies that the research respondents could be familiar with the reading topics and have sufficient background knowledge.

In contrast to the performance in finding main ideas, the respondents performed the lowest in identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse, 76% for the high achievers and 36% for the low achievers. In the reading test, some questions related to identifying the meaning of the text's expressions ask for synonyms. Due to the insufficient vocabulary repertoire, the answer options could be unfamiliar to the respondents, and they needed clues to predict the meaning, resulting in their inability to choose the correct answers. This explanation could be why the high and low achievers scored the lowest in identifying the meaning of expressions used in the written discourse. This finding confirms the study which stated that the reading comprehension and listening comprehension process involves a general comprehension process, with vocabulary as the important component (Wolf et al., 2019). Vocabulary correlates linearly with identifying the meaning of words, stated or implied/inferential meaning (Wolf et al., 2019), and vocabulary is essential for achieving success in English proficiency tests (Hastuti, 2019). Vocabulary also plays an important role in comprehension (Tschirner, 2016).

Moreover, in reading comprehension, vocabulary is one of the high evidence-correlates (Jeon & Yamashita, 2014). Furthermore, vocabulary has a significant correlation with L2 reading comprehension and L2 listening comprehension (Zhang & Zhang, 2020). Therefore, systematic and massive vocabulary enrichment programs, as well as extensive listening and extensive reading, are the best methods to gain success in improving the English proficiency skills of EFL learners and non-English Department students, including the Vocational Lecturers. The research findings have confirmed that listening and reading skills correlated positively and significantly (with a correlation coefficient of 0.785). Concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the high and low achievers' four receptive subskills, the same pattern of subskill rank orders applies to both groups. For listening, the rank order is as follows: finding main ideas, answering implied-detail questions, identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse, and answering stated-detail questions. For reading, the pattern goes from finding main ideas, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse. Though both groups shared the same pattern of rank order, it does not mean that they had the same strength of subskills. In the listening test, the high achievers had strengths in all of the subskills, whereas the low achievers' performance in all the subskills was below

50%, which implies that they had weaknesses in all of the listening subskills. In the reading test, the high achievers also had strengths in all of the subskills, whereas the low achievers scored more than 50% in the subskills of finding main ideas and answering stated-detail questions. The other two subskills got 50% for answering implied-detail questions and 36% for identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse. The research findings suggest sufficient vocabulary repertoire is needed to support optimal listening and reading comprehension. Concerning the relatively low performance in the subskill of identifying the meaning of expressions used in both oral and written discourse, widening the lexical knowledge or vocabulary 'database' is one way to improve it, a planned intensive treatment to enrich background knowledge and vocabulary is necessary to improve comprehension (Vidal, 2011). A careful, well-planned, and systematic vocabulary enrichment program, including extensive listening and extensive reading, are highly recommended to improve the English proficiency skills of EFL learners, including non-English Department students and specifically the Vocational Lecturers.

4. CONCLUSION

The research findings have confirmed that listening and reading skills correlated positively and. Concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the high and low achievers' four receptive subskills, the same pattern of subskill rank orders applies to both groups. For listening, the rank order is as follows: finding main ideas, answering implied-detail questions, identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the oral discourse, and answering stated-detail questions. For reading, the pattern goes from finding main ideas, answering stated-detail questions, answering implied-detail questions, and identifying the meaning of the expressions used in the written discourse.

5. ACKNOWLEDGE

The research has been funded by Widya Mandala Surabaya Foundation and distributed through The Research and Community Service Center of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University. The official document to assign the researchers to conduct this research is the assignment letter of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, number 5303/WM01/N/2021. The research funding uses the Research and Community Service Center budget number 616.02.2439.

6. REFERENCES

- Chang, A. C. (2009). Gains to L2 listeners from reading while listening vs. listening only in comprehending short stories. *System*, 37(4), 652–663. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.09.009>.
- Diakidoy, I. A. N., Stylianou, P., Karefillidou, C., & Papageorgiou, P. (2005). The relationship between listening and reading comprehension of different types of text at increasing grade levels. *Reading Psychology*, 26(1), 55–80. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02702710590910584>.
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2009). Effective Practices for Developing Reading Comprehension. *Journal of Education*, 189(1–2), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057409189001-208>.
- Dunlosky, J., & Bjork, R. A. (2013). Handbook of metamemory and memory. In *Handbook of Metamemory and Memory*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203805503>.
- Ekasary, M., Mahmud, M., & Salija, K. (2022). The Use of Learners' Background Knowledge to Connect to Text on Reading Comprehension. *Pinisi Journal of Art, Humanity and Social Studies*, 2(1), 48–53.
- Francois Le Ny, J., & Kintsch, W. (1982). *Advances in Psychology 9: Language and Comprehension* (G. E. Stelmach & P. A. Vroom (eds.)). North Holland Publishing Company.
- Hashemian, M., & Fadaei, B. (2013). The Effect of Lexical Glossing Types on Persian L2 Learners' Reading and Listening. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 70, 490–500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.086>.
- Hastuti, U. N. (2019). Correlation between Reading Comprehension and Listening Comprehension Skills in Completing TOEFL-PBT. *JournE*, 1(2), 45–52.
- Hogan, T. P., Adlof, S. M., & Alonzo, C. N. (2014). On the importance of listening comprehension. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 16(3), 199–207. <https://doi.org/10.3109/17549507.2014.904441>.
- Jeon, E. H., & Yamashita, J. (2014). L2 reading comprehension and its correlates: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 64(1), 160–212. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12034>.
- Kirana, A. W. (2022). Issues in reading comprehension: A case of an Indonesian bilingual dyslexic student. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 11(3), 488–501. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v11i3.33581>.

- Magfirah, T. (2018). Students' Reading and Listening Comprehension Based on Their Learning Styles. *International Journal of Education*, 10(2), 107–113. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v10i2.8028>.
- Mankinen, K., Ipatti, P., Harila, M., Nikkinen, J., Paakki, J. J., Rytty, S., Starck, T., Remes, J., Tokariev, M., Carlson, S., Tervonen, O., Rantala, H., & Kiviniemi, V. (2015). Reading, listening and memory-related brain activity in children with early-stage temporal lobe epilepsy of unknown cause-an fMRI study. *European Journal of Paediatric Neurology*, 19(5), 561–571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpn.2015.05.001>.
- Marchetti, G. (2014). Attention and working memory: Two basic mechanisms for constructing temporal experiences. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5(AUG), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00880>.
- Meyer, A. S., Huettig, F., & Levelt, W. J. M. (2016). Same, different, or closely related: What is the relationship between language production and comprehension? *Journal of Memory and Language*, 89, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jml.2016.03.002>.
- Nurhayati, N., & Nehe, B. (2016). an Analysis of Students' Strategies in Answering Toefl. *Journal of English Language Studies*, 1(1), 10–18. <https://doi.org/10.30870/jels.v1i1.682>.
- Palmer, M. (2012). *A Comparative Study of Listening and Reading Comprehension in Children of Different Age-Groups* (Issue May 1997). University of Pretoria.
- Safitri, M., Wulyani, A. N., & Suharyadi, S. (2021). The correlation between students' reading and listening score in a standardized test of TOEFL. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengkajian Ilmu Pendidikan: E-Saintika*, 5(2), 127–138. <https://doi.org/10.36312/esaintika.v5i2.472>.
- Sapoetra, J. (2017). Listening, Grammar and Reading Comprehension Skills of the Test of English as a Foreign Language: A Correlational Study. *Humaniora*, 8(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.21512/humaniora.v8i1.3692>.
- Sheth, T. (2015). Receptive skills-listening and reading: A sin qua non for engineers. *International Journal of English*, 3(3), 222–228.
- Sonia, A., & Fisher, H. (2016). Students' reading techniques difficulties in recount text. *English and Education*, 4(2), 1–12.
- Tschirner, E. (2016). Listening and Reading Proficiency Levels of College Students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 49(2), 201–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12198>.
- van Zeeland, H., & Schmitt, N. (2013). Incidental vocabulary acquisition through L2 listening: Adimensions approach. *System*, 41(3), 609–624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.07.012>.
- Vidal, K. (2011). A Comparison of the Effects of Reading and Listening on Incidental Vocabulary Acquisition. *Language Learning*, 61(1), 219–258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00593.x>.
- Wang, H. (2018). *Conclusion and Recommendations. In Testing Lecture Comprehension Through Listening-to-summarize Cloze Tasks*. Springer.
- Wolf, M. C., Muijselaar, M. M. L., Boonstra, A. M., & de Bree, E. H. (2019). The relationship between reading and listening comprehension: shared and modality-specific components. *Reading and Writing*, 32(7), 1747–1767. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11145-018-9924-8>.
- Zhang, S., & Zhang, X. (2020). The relationship between vocabulary knowledge and L2 reading/listening comprehension: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 00(0), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820913998>.
- Zulmaini, E. A. (2021). Teaching and learning process of test-taking strategies in answering reading comprehension section. *ELT Forum: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.15294/elt.v10i2.43281>.