



Asya Studies

Akademik Sosyal Araştırmalar / Academic Social Studies

Year: 9, Number: 33, p. 239-252, Autumn 2025

Exploring the Relationship between Receptive and Productive Skills in EFL Test Performance: Evidence from a Turkish Preparatory Class Context of a State University in Türkiye*

İngilizceyi Yabancı Dil Olarak Öğrenen Türk Öğrencilerinin Test Puanlarındaki Alıcı ve Üretici Becerileri Arasındaki İlişkiler: Hazırlık Sınıfı Örneği

ISSN: 2602-2877 / E-ISSN: 2602-263X

Araştırma Makalesi
Research Article

Makale Geliş Tarihi
Article Arrival Date
07/03/2025

Makale Kabul Tarihi
Article Accepted Date
02/09/2025

Makale Yayın Tarihi
Article Publication Date
25/09/2025

Asya Studies

Doç. Dr. Semahat Aysu
Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University
School of Foreign Languages
saysu@nku.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0001-6431-9983

* This study was carried out within the framework of the approval of Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University Ethics Committee dated 29/05/2023 and document number 305112.

Abstract

Learning a language requires the efficient use of the basic communication abilities of speaking, writing, listening, and reading. However, as skill development varies among students or settings, it is important to investigate their connections. Therefore, this study examines the relationship between receptive (reading and listening) and productive (speaking and writing) skills of Turkish EFL learners. The goal is to show how these four language skills relate to one another. Three main questions are investigated in this study: (1) Do students' receptive skills in the quizzes correlate with their productive skills?, (2) "Do students' receptive skills in the portfolio tasks correlate with their productive skills?", and (3) "Do students' receptive skills in the mid-term exam correlate with their productive skills?". Data were collected from 250 students through three assessment types: skill-specific quizzes, portfolio tasks, and a comprehensive mid-term exam. A descriptive research design was adopted, and correlation and regression analyses were conducted using SPSS 25. The results revealed strong and statistically significant relationships among all four language skills across different assessment formats. In particular, receptive skills were found to significantly predict productive skills, suggesting a high degree of interdependence. These findings highlight the need for integrated skill instruction and assessment in EFL contexts. The study contributes to the fields of language pedagogy and assessment by providing empirical support for interconnected skill development. Future studies may elaborate by comparing various foreign language proficiency levels, examining longitudinal data, or investigating how integrated educational interventions might affect the relationship between productive and receptive abilities.

Keywords: Receptive Skills, Productive Skills, Language Learning, Assessment, Correlation

Öz

Bir dili öğrenmek, konuşma, yazma, dinleme ve okuma gibi temel iletişim becerilerinin etkili bir şekilde kullanılmasını gerektirir. Ancak, beceri gelişimi öğrenciler veya ortamlar açısından değiştiğinden, bu becerilerin ilişkilerini araştırmak önemlidir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışma İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen Türk öğrencilerinin alıcı (okuma ve dinleme) ve üretici (konuşma ve yazma) becerileri arasındaki ilişkiyi inceler. Bu çalışmada amaç, bu dört dil becerisinin birbirleriyle nasıl ilişkili olduğunu göstermektir. Bu çalışmada üç ana soru araştırılmaktadır: (1) Öğrencilerin kısa süreli sınavlardaki alıcı becerileri ile üretici becerileri ilişkili midir?, (2) "Öğrencilerin portfolyo çalışmalarındaki alıcı becerileri ile üretici becerileri ilişkili midir?" ve (3) "Öğrencilerin ara sınavdaki alıcı becerileri ile üretici becerileri ilişkili midir?". Öğrencilerin üç farklı değerlendirme türündeki – kısa süreli sınavlar, portfolyo çalışmaları ve ara sınav- performansı ile 250 öğrenciden veri toplanmıştır. Betimleyici bir araştırma deseni kullanıldı ve korelasyon ve regresyon analizleri SPSS 25 kullanılarak gerçekleştirildi. Sonuçlar, farklı değerlendirme türlerinde dört dil becerisi arasında güçlü ve istatistiksel olarak anlamlı ilişkiler olduğunu gösterdi. Özellikle, alıcı becerilerin üretken becerileri önemli ölçüde tahmin ettiği ve büyük ölçüde birbirine bağımlılığın olduğunu gösterdi. Bu bulgular, İngilizcenin yabancı dil olarak öğrenildiği ortamlarda bütünlük beceri eğitimi ve değerlendirmesine olan ihtiyacı vurgulamaktadır. Çalışma, birbirine bağlı beceri gelişimi için ampirik destek sağlayarak dil pedagojisi ve değerlendirme alanlarına katkıda bulunmaktadır. Gelecekteki çalışmalar, çeşitli yabancı dil yeterlilik düzeylerini karşılaştırarak, uzunlamasına verileri inceleyerek veya bütünlük eğitim müdahalelerinin üretken ve alıcı yetenekler arasındaki ilişkiyi nasıl etkileyebileceğini araştırarak konuyu daha da ayrıntılı hale getirebilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Alıcı Beceriler, Üretici Beceriler, Dil Öğrenimi, Değerlendirme, Korelasyon

Citation Information / Atıf Bilgisi

Aysu, S. (2025). Exploring the relationship between receptive and productive skills in EFL test performance: Evidence from a Turkish preparatory class context of a state university in Türkiye. *Asya Studies*, 9(33), 239-252.
<https://doi.org/10.31455/asya.1653483>

INTRODUCTION

Language is a primary medium of communication between people, facilitating the exchange of ideas and information (Sreena & Ilankumaran, 2018). It encompasses both receptive skills, such as listening and reading, and productive skills, including speaking and writing. Receptive skills enable individuals “to comprehend and understand language code,” while productive skills allow them “to express and utilize the language codes to transfer information” (Yuzar & Rejeki, 2020, p.101). These skills are often categorized as passive and active skills, respectively (Donald & Kneale, 2001; Sreena & Ilankumaran, 2018). As noted by Sreena and Ilankumaran (2018), “Without listening, no speaking is possible, without reading no writing is possible. So, the four skills go in pairs” (p.670). The theoretical relationship among these skills has been recognized; however, their practical correlation, especially in foreign language assessment, continues to be a subject of inquiry.

In Turkey, English is taught as a subject subject and as a medium of instruction at universities, which underscores the importance of mastering both receptive and productive skills (Napigkit & Rodriguez, 2017).

The significance of integrated skill development in teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) has been underlined by language educators in recent years. Nevertheless, standardized tests frequently separate abilities and evaluate them independently using distinct test components, even in spite of this pedagogical change. This approach poses significant queries regarding the real connection between receptive and productive skills in test performance, particularly for beginners. Additionally, there is still a lack of research on how various assessment formats—such as tests, portfolios, and quizzes—reflect the interaction between these skill sets in the Turkish EFL environment.

This study contributes in two ways. First of all, it adds to the small amount of empirical research that has been conducted in Turkey on the integrated nature of language skills in authentic classroom assessment contexts. Second, by examining relationships between various assessment formats, it provides information that can guide instructional strategies and assessment creation that supports integrated skill development. In order to promote more balanced skill development, teachers can use the findings to better understand the dynamics of language learning at the foundational (A1) level and modify their instruction accordingly. Therefore, this study will concentrate on students language skills in different language evaluation tools and following research questions will be answered in this study.

Research Question 1: Do students’ receptive skills in the quizzes correlate with their productive skills?

Research Question 2: Do students’ receptive skills in the portfolio tasks correlate with their productive skills?

Research Question 3: Do students’ receptive skills in the mid-term exam correlate with their productive skills?

LITERATURE REVIEW

Receptive Skills (reading and listening)

Receptive skills are categorized as meaning-focused input, as students often face challenges in understanding and accessing information through listening and reading. Examples of these skills include extensive listening and reading, watching films, and listening to conversations or stories. These activities align with Krashen's (1985) input hypothesis (Newton & Nation, 2021). Newton and Nation (2021) also identify two types of listening: one-way listening (traditional listening) and two-way listening (contemporary listening). While developing listening skills, learners may encounter difficulties such as fast speech, idiomatic expressions, unfamiliar structures, and unclear accents. However, factors like the topic and flow of the conversation, as well as the speaker's intonation, can make listening more comprehensible and easier to follow (Donald & Kneale, 2001). Despite these insights, the majority of literature tends to concentrate on the theoretical foundations of receptive skills while providing few useful tips for resolving these issues in a variety of educational settings. This gap emphasizes the need for more empirical studies on the ways in which instructional interventions might help students improve their reading and listening skills.

Productive Skills (Writing and Speaking)

Productive skills are regarded as meaning-focused output because they involve the active use of language (Newton & Nation, 2021). Examples include "talking in conversations, giving a speech or lecture, writing a letter, writing a note to someone, keeping a diary, telling a story, and telling someone how to do something" (p. 4). These skills align with Swain's (1985) output hypothesis, which highlights the importance of language production in promoting linguistic development (Newton & Nation, 2021).

In order to facilitate the effective teaching of productive skills, Newton and Nation (2021, pp. 12–13) proposed a set of pedagogical principles. These include: (1) providing and organizing large amounts of comprehensible input through both listening and reading; (2) boosting learning through comprehensible input by adding a deliberate element; (3) supporting and pushing learners to produce spoken and written output in a variety of appropriate genres; (4) providing opportunities for cooperative interaction; (5) helping learners deliberately learn language items and patterns, including sounds, spelling, vocabulary, multi-word units, grammar, and discourse; (6) training learners in strategies that will contribute to autonomous language learning; (7) providing fluency development activities in each of the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing; (8) providing a roughly equal balance of the four strands of meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, language-focused learning, and fluency development; (9) planning for repeated coverage of the most useful language items; (10) using needs analysis, monitoring, and assessment to help address learners' language and communication needs.

All of these ideas together highlight the need for an integrated and well-rounded approach to language instruction. In addition to improving students' speaking and writing abilities, they also help them build their receptive skills, which leads to a more thorough and long-lasting mastery of the language. This is achieved by integrating input, output, and targeted practice.

Previous Studies

Both receptive (reading and listening) and productive (writing and speaking) skills have an important place in the language learning process of Optional Preparatory Class students. These skills are typically measured through quizzes, portfolio activities and mid-term exams. The present study seeks to examine The relationship of these skills that students have in different test environments. Although there are some studies (Demirel Fakiroğlu, 2021; Hirai, 2002; Napigkit & Rodriguez, 2017; Yuzar & Rejeki, 2020) examining the correlation between language productive and receptive skills, few have explored these relationships for the same students across different test types.

Yuzar and Rejeki (2020) conducted a study in order to reveal the connection between receptive and productive language skills of the Australian Defence Force English Language profiling Systems (ADFELPS) tests to measure English proficiency level of Indonesian army officers before going abroad. Their findings indicated a strong correlation between receptive and productive skills, with listening identified as the most challenging area. Similarly, Hirai (2002) examined the relationship between BULATS Writing test scores, interview test scores, and TOEIC scores of 475 students enrolled in an intensive business English program in Japan. Results revealed a strong relationship between speaking and TOEIC scores, while writing was only moderately correlated.

In a Turkish context, Demirel-Fakiroğlu (2021) examined the relationship between students' receptive skills and productive skills at various levels (A1, A2, and B1). Findings revealed that students' grades at A2 level were higher than other levels. Moreover, writing, reading, and listening outcomes were stronger at A1 than at B1. However, there were no significant differences in speaking performance across levels, except between B1 and A2, where B1 students scored lower.

Other studies also shed light on these dynamics. Napigkit and Rodriguez (2017) examined 33 first-year university students in the Philippines and found a significant correlation between reading and writing but no relationship between listening, speaking, and writing. Similarly, Darabi (2012) reported a significant correlation between receptive and productive collocational knowledge. A broader perspective was provided by Warsito (2023), who reported that students performed better in receptive skills than in productive ones.

Despite these studies, gaps remain in understanding the interplay between receptive and productive skills across various test settings. Besides, there is a lack of studies in Turkish context, which focus on to what extent Turkish EFL students' receptive skills affect their productive skills.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a descriptive correlational research design to investigate the connections between productive and receptive language skills in an EFL context at the university level. The goal of this design was to determine the strength and direction of the correlations between the four language skills as determined by several assessment instruments. This research design is

suitable in this situation since it allows the researcher to investigate the relationship between the variables and predict scores without the need for experimental intervention (Creswell, 2012).

Participants and Setting

The study involved 250 A1-level Turkish EFL learners enrolled in the English preparatory program of a state university in Türkiye. All the students took a placement test at the beginning of term and started their preparatory program according to their language level. They enrolled in this program voluntarily and were aged between 18 and 22. The instructional program followed the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and integrated all four language skills throughout the curriculum. During the term they were assessed through quizzes (each quiz focuses on a different skill), portfolio tasks (each task consists of one productive or receptive skill), mid-term exam (mid-term exam includes both productive and receptive skills), and online practice scores which were not the concern of this study. In the following part these three evaluation ways will be listed with the skills.

Data Collection Instruments and Procedure

After gathering the ethical approval form the university ethics committee, the present study was carried out considering the ethical guidelines set by the Ethics Committee.

Three primary assessment formats—quizzes, portfolio activities, and a midterm exam—were used to gather data. Each type of test was intended to evaluate a distinct language competence. Each of the four quizzes focused on a different skill (writing, speaking, listening, and reading). To ensure interrater reliability, standardized rubrics created by the university's Testing Office were utilized to assess productive tasks (writing and speaking). In-class and process writing assignments were included in the portfolio, along with student-uploaded speaking assignments that were filmed on video. The midterm exam functioned as a cumulative evaluation and included both receptive and productive components. Every instrument's score was noted and made anonymous for examination. At the beginning of the academic term, the Testing Unit of School of Foreign Languages informed lecturers and students of the predetermined content, duration, and evaluation criteria of each speaking task. Consequently, the researchers had no influence over how these activities were carried out or evaluated.

Assessment Tools

Quizzes

Quiz 1-Listening- includes multiple choice questions and fill-in the blank questions and students' quiz papers were evaluated using the answer key presented by Testing Office

Quiz 2-Reading- includes multiple choice questions and open-ended questions with short answers and their exams were marked using answer key provided by Testing Office

Quiz 3- Speaking- includes speaking topics which were shared before the quiz as students at A1 level were familiar with the topics and students were asked to talk about the random topic they chose in the box and their speaking was evaluated considering speaking evaluation criteria provided by Testing office

Quiz 4-Writing- includes writing a short paragraph, which was evaluated using non-academic writing evaluation criteria developed by Testing Office

Portfolio Tasks

Portfolio In-Class Writing Task- includes writing paragraphs in the class and they were marked using non-academic writing evaluation developed by Testing Office

Portfolio Process Writing Task- includes writing the first draft of the paragraphs in the class and maximum 3 drafts could be written and final drafts were marked using non-academic writing evaluation criteria developed by Testing Office

Portfolio Speaking Task- includes recording a video between 3-5 minutes while talking about one of the topics shared by their teachers, which is uploaded on YouTube. Their videos were evaluated using speaking task evaluation criteria offered by Testing Office

Mid-Term Exam

Mid-term exam- Listening, which was similar to Listening quiz

Mid-term exam- Reading, which was similar to Reading quiz

Mid-term exam-Writing, which was similar to Portfolio In-Class Writing Task

Mid-term exam- Speaking, which was similar to Speaking quiz, but talking topics were not shared with the students before the exam.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

After receiving permission of the Ethics Committee at university, this study was conducted. Students' quizzes scores, portfolio tasks scores and mid-term exam score were collected and fed into computer. Firstly, SPSS 25 was used to check the normality of data and it was revealed that data in the current study was accepted to be normal as the values for kurtosis were between -2 and + 2 (George & Mallery, 2010), and then analyses such as correlation and regression analyses were run.

FINDINGS

Research Question 1: Do students' receptive skills in the quizzes correlate with their productive skills?

Table 1: Correlations between Productive Skills and Receptive Skills in terms of Quiz Scores

Correlations		quiz_writing	quiz_speaking	quiz_listening	quiz_reading
quiz_writing	Pearson Correlation	1	.809**	.736**	.780**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	250	250	250	250
quiz_speaking	Pearson Correlation	.809**	1	.815**	.812**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	250	250	250	250
quiz_listening	Pearson Correlation	.736**	.815**	1	.850**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	250	250	250	250
quiz_reading	Pearson Correlation	.780**	.812**	.850**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	250	250	250	250

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As it is seen in Table 1, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' writing quiz scores and speaking quiz scores ($r=.809$, $p=.00$); their listening quiz scores ($r=.736$, $p=.00$) and their reading quiz scores ($r=.780$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level. Also, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' speaking quiz scores and their listening quiz scores ($r=.815$, $p=.00$); their reading quiz scores ($r=.812$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level. Finally, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' listening quiz scores and reading quiz scores ($r=.850$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level. In the following, the effect of receptive skills on one of the productive skills (writing) was examined.

Table 2: Effect of Listening and Reading on Writing in terms of Quiz Scores

Independent Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Standard Error	F Model
Listening	.736	.542	.541		22.701	293.904*
Reading	.780	.609	.607		20.987	385.999*

* $p<.05$

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to see the effects of receptive skills on writing skill in terms of quiz scores. According to the findings shown in Table 2 above, listening skill ($F(1, 248)=293.904$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in writing skill. Also, listening skill explains 54% of the variation in writing skill. Furthermore, reading skill ($F(1,$

248)=385.999, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in writing skill. Also, reading skill explains 60% of the variation in writing skill.

Table 3: Effect of Listening and Reading on Speaking in terms of Quiz Scores

Independent Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Standard Error	F Model
Listening	.815	.664	.663		18.758	490.992*
Reading	.812	.659	.657		18.915	478.847*

* $p<.05$

Multiple regression analysis was carried out to reveal the effect of receptive skills on speaking skill in terms of quiz scores. According to the findings shown in Table 3 above, listening skill ($F(1, 248)=490.992$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in speaking skill. Also, listening skill explains 66% of the variation in speaking skill. Furthermore, reading skill ($F(1, 248)=478.847$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in speaking skill. Also, reading skill explains 65% of the variation in speaking skill.

Research Question 2: Do students' receptive skills in the portfolio tasks correlate with their productive skills?

Table 4: Correlations between Productive Skills and Receptive Skills in terms of Portfolio Task Scores

Correlations		portfolio_writing 1	portfolio_writing 2	portfolio_speaking g
portfolio_writing1	Pearson	1	.578**	.528**
	Correlation			
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	250	250	250
portfolio_writing2	Pearson	.578**	1	.568**
	Correlation			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	250	250	250
portfolio_speaking	Pearson	.528**	.568**	1
	Correlation			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	250	250	250

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 4, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' first portfolio writing task scores and their second portfolio writing task scores ($r=.578$, $p=.00$); their portfolio speaking task scores ($r=.528$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level. Also, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' second portfolio writing task scores and their portfolio speaking task scores ($r=.568$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level.

Table 5: Effect of Portfolio Writing Tasks on Portfolio Speaking Task

Independent Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Standard Error	F Model
In-class writing task	.523	.279	.276		34.213	95.773*
Process writing task	.568	.322	.319		33.165	117.851*

*p<.05

Multiple regression analysis was run to see the effects of writing skill on speaking skill in terms of portfolio tasks. According to the findings, portfolio in-class writing task ($F(1, 248)=95.773, p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in portfolio speaking task. Also, portfolio in-class writing task explains 27% of the variation in portfolio speaking task. Also, portfolio process writing task ($F(1, 248)=117.851, p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in portfolio speaking task. Also, portfolio process writing task explains 32% of the variation in portfolio speaking task.

Research Question 3: Do students' receptive skills in the mid-term exam correlate with their productive skills?

Table 6: Correlations between Productive Skills and Receptive Skills in terms of Mid-Term Exam Scores

Correlations		test_writing	test_speaking	test_listening	test_reading
test_writing	Pearson Correlation	1	.836**	.809**	.824**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	250	250	250	250
test_speaking	Pearson Correlation	.836**	1	.842**	.830**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	250	250	250	250
test_listening	Pearson Correlation	.809**	.842**	1	.884**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	250	250	250	250
test_reading	Pearson Correlation	.824**	.830**	.884**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	250	250	250	250

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As it is demonstrated in Table 6, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' writing test scores and speaking test scores ($r=.836, p=.00$); their listening test scores ($r=.809, p=.00$) and their reading test scores ($r=.824, p=.00$) at the 0.01 level. Moreover, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' speaking test scores and their

listening test scores ($r=.842$, $p=.00$); their reading test scores ($r=.830$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level. Finally, there is a statistically significant relationship between the students' listening test scores and reading test scores ($r=.884$, $p=.00$) at the 0.01 level.

Table 7: Effect of Listening and Reading on Writing in terms of Mid-Term Exam Scores

Independent Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Standard Error	F Model
Listening	.809	.655	.654		19.430	471.048*
Reading	.824	.679	.678		18.748	524.302*

* $p<.05$

Multiple regression analysis was carried out to understand the effects of receptive skills on writing skill, which is a part of the mid-term exam. According to the findings shown in Table 7 above, listening skill ($F(1, 248)=471.048$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in writing skill. Also, listening skill explains 65% of the variation in writing skill. Furthermore, reading skill ($F(1, 248)=524.302$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in writing skill. Also, reading skill explains 67% of the variation in writing skill.

Table 8: Effect of Listening and Reading on Speaking in terms of Test Scores

Independent Variables	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R	Standard Error	F Model
Listening	.842	.708	.707		18.974	602.581*
Reading	.830	.689	.688		19.599	549.191*

* $p<.05$

Multiple regression analysis was run to show the effects of receptive skills on speaking skill, which is a part of the mid-term exam. According to the findings shown in Table 8 above, listening skill ($F(1, 248)=602.581$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in speaking skill. Also, listening skill explains 70% of the variation in speaking skill. Furthermore, reading skill ($F(1, 248)=549.191$, $p=.00$) statistically significantly explains the variation in speaking skill. Also, reading skill explains 68% of the variation in speaking skill.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The formation of a second language is fluid, non-linear, and influenced by constant context adaption, which makes language a complex and dynamic system. Instead of going through set phases, learner language changes gradually and abruptly through shifting patterns. Every student has a different growth path that is shaped by their own linguistic resources and surroundings. When the language system self-organizes over time, accuracy, fluency, and complexity arise through active use (Larsen-Freeman, 2006).

Guided by this dynamic systems perspective, the current study aimed to explore the relationship between receptive skills (listening, reading) and productive skills (speaking, writing) through various assessment tools used in an elective English Preparatory Class at a Turkish state university. This study attempted to fill a critical gap in the literature by examining the interplay of receptive and productive skills across different assessment ways. Although prior research (e.g.,

Yuzar & Rejeki, 2020; Hirai, 2002) has explored correlations between language skills, limited attention has been paid to comparisons within the same setting using different assessment ways (quizzes, portfolio tasks and mid-term exam).

Firstly, the results revealed strong correlations among students' quiz scores across writing, speaking, listening, and reading skills, showing that mastery of one language skill is strongly related to other language skills. The strong association between speaking and listening ($r = .815$), for instance, is consistent with how these two abilities naturally depend on one another in everyday communication. Reading and writing also have a connection ($r = .780$) that illustrates the mutual reinforcement of comprehension and production, which is also in line with the study of Sreena & Ilankumaran (2018). They noted “listening precedes speaking and reading makes a way for writing” (p.672). These results highlight how language learning is interrelated and imply that enhancing one ability can have positive effects on others. They also draw attention to the necessity of a balanced teaching strategy in order to guarantee that all abilities are developed simultaneously and prevent any potential gaps in students' language proficiency.

Secondly, in the context of portfolio-based assessments, the results showed statistically significant correlations between students' portfolio task scores, suggesting a significant relationship between speaking and writing skills. The moderate correlation between the first and second portfolio writing task scores ($r = .578$) suggests consistent writing performance over time, potentially reflecting the development of writing proficiency through practice and feedback. Additionally, the correlation between speaking and writing task scores ($r = .568$ for the second writing test and $r = .528$ for the first writing task) emphasizes how interdependent productive skills are. This implies that either common underlying characteristics, like vocabulary or grammatical knowledge, contribute to both, or that gains in one productive skill, like writing, may have a favorable impact on the other, like speaking. These findings highlight how beneficial portfolio assessments are for monitoring development and reaffirming how interrelated language skills are. To improve students' general language proficiency, teachers should think about creating integrated assignments that connect speaking and writing. The finding concurred with the studies of Aysu (2022) and Barootchi and Keshavarz (2002), which examined the role of portfolio assessment on language achievement. Furthermore, Yamashita (2002) revealed that language proficiency is also directly related to L2 reading ability.

Finally, the findings indicated the strong and statistically significant correlations across all language skills in test scores. This highlighted the importance of an integrated approach to language instruction, in which all skills should be taught together to foster language proficiency. Furthermore, these findings suggest that language skill development is strongly linked to interconnected linguistic and cognitive processes, which is also supported in a longitudinal research conducted by Babayiğit and Stainthorp (2007). They discovered that early phonological awareness was a strong predictor of spelling outcomes over time although it did not significantly predict reading abilities. Therefore, receptive and productive skills might also be impacted by common cognitive abilities such as working memory, phonological processing, and morphosyntactic knowledge. Vasylets and Marín (2021) confirmed that working memory contributed to L2 writing. At lower proficiency, it was linked to greater accuracy, but at higher proficiency, it was positively related to lexical sophistication. However, Manchón et al. (2023) discovered that whereas L2 proficiency had a significant impact on writing performance, working

memory had no effect on writing performance and did not interact with proficiency in predicting writing quality.

Limitations and Suggestions

Although this study provides valuable insights into the relationship between receptive and productive abilities among Turkish EFL learners at the A1 level, it should be highlighted that it has a number of limitations. The study was only carried out in one institution, which would limit the results, which cannot be generalized in other contexts. Furthermore, by concentrating on A1 students, comparisons across all competency levels are not possible. This raises the question for advanced pupils. Furthermore, the cross-sectional design restricts how these associations evolve over time. Lastly, the study did not assess the impact of integrated instructional interventions, which could provide more insight into the interdependence of skills. By comparing various English language levels, using longitudinal designs, and evaluating integrated teaching strategies, future research may fill up these gaps.

Authorship Contribution

This research was conducted by a single author.

Ethics Committee Statement

Ethics committee approval is required for this research.

Information of Ethics Committee Approval: Tekirdağ Namık Kemal University

Date of approval: 29.05.2023

Document No: 305112

REFERENCES

- Aysu, S. (2022). The role of portfolio assessment and quizzes on class attendance and language achievement. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(11), 1-10.
- Babayigit, S., & Stainthorp, R. (2007). Preliterate phonological awareness and early literacy skills in Turkish. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 30(4), 394-413.
- Barootchi, N., & Keshavarz, M.H. (2002). Assessment of achievement through portfolios and teacher-made tests. *Educational Research*, 44(3), 279-288.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson
- Darabi, A. (2012). On the possible relationship between receptive and productive knowledge of collocational patterns among Iranian TEFL university students. *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 8(2), 114-127.
- Demirel-Fakiroğlu, G. (2021). The relationship between receptive and productive skills of international Turkish learners in Turkey. *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, 6(16), 1747-1776.
- Donald, S. G., & Kneale, P. E. (2001). *Study skills for language students: A practical guide*. Arnold.

- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update*. Pearson.
- Hirai, M. (2002). Correlations between active skill and passive skill test scores. *Shiken: JALT Testing & Evaluation SIG Newsletter*, 6(3), 2-8.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in the oral and written production of five Chinese learners of English. *Applied linguistics*, 27(4), 590-619.
- Manchón, R. M., McBride, S., Martínez, M. D. M., & Vasylets, O. (2023). Working memory, L2 proficiency, and task complexity: Independent and interactive effects on L2 written performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 45(3), 737-764.
- Napigkit, C. Q., & Rodriguez, E. C. (2017). Receptive skill in reading correlates with students' writing competence. *JPAIR Institutional Research*, 9, 124-140.
- Newton, J. M., & Nation, I. S. P. (2021). *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. Routledge.
- Sreena, S., & Ilankumaran, M. (2018). Developing productive skills through receptive skills – a cognitive approach. *International Journal of Engineering & Technology*, 7(4.36), 669-673.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- Vasylets, O., & Marín, J. (2021). The effects of working memory and L2 proficiency on L2 writing. *Journal of Second language writing*, 52, 100786.
- Warsito, A. P. (2023). *Comparing the students' productive and receptive skills of the six semesters of English department at Iain Parepare* (Thesis). IAIN Parepare.
- Yamashita, J. (2002). Mutual compensation between L1 reading ability and L2 language proficiency in L2 reading comprehension. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 25(1), 81-95.
- Yuzar, E., & Rejeki, S. (2020). Correlation between productive and receptive language skills: an examination on ADFELPS test scores. *SALEE: Study of Applied Linguistics and English Education*, 1(2), 99-113.
-

