Receptive Skill in Reading Correlates with Students' Writing Competence

CHORLA Q. NAPIGKIT
http://orcid.org 0000- 0002-5765-1440
chorlanapigkit@gmail.com
Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Tampilisan Campus
Tampilisan, Zamboanga del Norte

ELMIRA C. RODRIGUEZ
http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1358-8440
elmira.c.rodriguez@gmail.com
Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Tampilisan Campus
Tampilisan, Zamboanga del Norte

ABSTRACT

A good reading comprehension could result to a better writing competence. However, a number of the Bachelor of Elementary Education students of Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Tampilisan Campus were observed to be a bit weak in the use of receptive and productive skills as evidenced by their responses in the teaching-learning situations. The study assessed the level of the receptive and productive skills of the 1st year BEEd students of JRMSU-TC, S.Y. 2012-2013. The study used the descriptive-evaluative method to determine the level of the receptive skills, namely, listening and reading comprehension, and productive skills, namely, speaking and writing competencies. The researchers conducted a test on the subjects using test questionnaires, picture cues, and composition writing. Using frequency counting, percentage, weighted mean and multiple regression analysis, the study revealed that majority of the subjects is "good" in their productive skills such as speaking and writing competencies. The students' receptive skills, particularly in reading comprehension significantly relate to their writing ability, but there is an insignificant relationship between reading

and speaking as well as in listening comprehension that negates their speaking and writing competencies. Therefore, a significant association exists between reading and writing, but there is no significant relationship between listening and speaking as well as into writing.

Keywords — Language and Communication, receptive and productive skills, descriptive-evaluative method, Philippines

INTRODUCTION

English is one of approximately 6,900 living languages in the world (Gordon, 2005). In tabulating the number of native speakers of English, Crystal (2003: 65) includes not just speakers of English in countries such as the United States or Canada who speak English from birth, but speakers of English pidgins and creoles. As a result, there are over 430 million speakers of English as a native language. Crystal (2003: 68) also notes that there are many countries in which English is spoken for which we have no information as to the number of speakers, and in which English is spoken as a second or foreign language. If the number of English speakers includes speakers of pidgins and creoles, as well as speakers of English as a foreign language, Crystal (2003: 69), estimates that roughly 1.5 billion people speak English.

English is the most widely spoken language not just in the world, but in the history of civilization. It is widely used around the world – not just in countries in which it is a native language (Australia, Canada, Ireland, Great Britain, New Zealand, and the United States) but in many other countries in which it is either a second language (Philippines, Hong Kong, India, Kenya, Tanzania, and Singapore) or a foreign language (most of Western Europe). In addition, anyone who flies to a commercial airlines must be fluent in English, since it is the lingua franca of the airline industry; in all major tourist areas of the world, shopkeepers, hotel clerks, and others involved in the tourist industry will commonly have some knowledge of English (Meyer, 2009). Otherwise, he/she will have a difficulty in communicating with other people who have different languages.

According to Tejero (2008), the highly competitive world is fast-paced which necessitates humanity to enhance people's communication skills, especially in English to survive. Without these skills, one may be left out while others are scampering to reach the heights of their ambitions and careers. The skillfulness in language and communication is not only desired but has now become a necessity.

Powers (2010) asserted that effective communication is a two-way activity involving both the sender and receiver of the message. The listener or reader has as much responsibility in understanding the message as the speaker or writer has in presenting it. For effective communication to occur, people must not only speak or write, but they must also understand how others have perceived their messages if they are to respond in ways that address their audience's concerns and questions.

The issue of proficiency in different language skills is relevant to students at tertiary level as the amount of reading materials to cover and written assignments to complete is overwhelming (Kavaliauskiene & Kaminskiene, 2009). To make communication successfully be carried out (Harmer, 2007), four skills of English are required: speaking, writing, listening, and reading. The former two skills are called productive skill where students actually have to produce language themselves, and the latter two are called receptive skill where meaning is extracted from the discourse. Receptive language skills are crucial in the pathway to oral language and literacy proficiency, along with expressive language skills (Barnett, Yarosz, Thomas, Jung, & Blanco, 2007). Receptive language skills comprise the comprehension of what is said and what is read as decoding operations. Expressive (productive) language skills are related not only to the ability to retrieve ideas and lexicons but also the ability to express ideas and thoughts in response to the given demand in an oral or written manner. Thus, developing the macro-skills of communication such as reading, listening, writing and speaking can be beneficial. Notably, learners differ from one another in their acquisition of a second language. Some appeared to master the features of grammar and pronunciation while some seemed to develop vocabulary acquisition. These can be learned through constant use and exposure to the language. Encounters with word structure can enhance understanding and formulation of ideas. Mere functional literacy is not enough to attain a high level of proficiency and become effective and contributing members of the profession and business world but, the macro-skills in English language acquisition should be regarded as equally important as these are interrelated skills to cope with the demand of time. Thus, language incompetence will lag behind those who are articulate and proficient in the language.

Relatively, English is a universal language used in most of the subjects in the elementary and secondary education. At the same time, it is a requisite to all college students since it is the medium of instruction in almost all of the disciplines in the tertiary courses. Due to this, it is imperative to master the

skills in the English language, particularly, the receptive and productive skills. According to Kavaliauskiene and Kaminskiene (2009), the investigation of connection between receptive and productive skills in second language needs theoretical, experiential, and experimental foundation. They further stressed that English language teachers are well aware of the qualitative dependence, that is, well-read learners are better speakers and writers. In 2004, Kavaliauskiene noted that there is an obvious link between reading and writing wherein they are interdependent and reciprocal processes, both are personal and social activities, which naturally intersect in the process of learning. Furthermore, Alderson and Banerjee (2002) posited that reading and writing are inseparable. As Gunning (2005) puts it, reading and writing are two sides of the same coin since both involve pre, during, and post activities. Besides, both are cognitive and similar processes of composing meaning that a training in one leads to the gain of the other.

Given the information above, it can be surmised that only few studies has been explored to investigate the relationship between receptive and productive skills of the College of Education students in terms of reading and writing. Inasmuch as a number of the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) students of Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Tampilisan Campus, Philippines are observed to be a bit weak in the use of English evident in their responses in the teaching-learning situations. Most of them experienced difficulty in the productive skills as observed through low scores in quizzes, major examinations as well as in fluency and accuracy in oral recitation. Teachers assumed that only those who spent much time in listening, reading, speaking and writing performed well in spoken interaction and written assessment. Some instructors' commented that there is a need to inject strategies in the class to compliment the students' acquisition of the second language competencies. The study determined the level of performance of the BEED-I students in the receptive and productive skills. It further investigated the significant relationship that exists between their reading and writing skills.

FRAMEWORK

The study is generally anchored on the theory of reading-writing connection. Rosenblatt (1988) stated that the relationship between reading and writing are closely linked. In the light of general trends, she presented a coherent theoretical approach to the interrelationships of the reading and writing processes. According to her, the relationship between reading and writing encompasses a network of

parallelisms and differences. Productive competency is the ability to produce coherent, appropriate and relevant messages in writing and speaking. It is also the ability to express and organize thoughts appropriately. Also, productive competency is more often associated with writing because writing involves producing text such as writing letter or essay.

The study is also based on the influential and controversial theory of Krashen (1984) on language acquisition which according to the theory, the significance of speaking lies in its claim that input was both imperative and adequate for language acquisition. Krashen claims that "speaking is not necessary", that learners acquire language solely through input.

This claim was tested by a study described by Palmer (1992). A university introductory language program was designed based on the Krashen's hypotheses. Students were not expected to produce any language. Materials consisted of input that was designed to be optimally comprehensible to learners. At the end of the course, student achievement and proficiency were compared to that of students who learned in customary courses. The results were not supportive of Krashen's claims. The proficiency of students who learned with the experimental approach was substantially inferior to that of students who learned in conventional classes. This study strongly suggests that language learning requires more than a just comprehensible input.

The study is also anchored on the growing realization among teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) that the overt processes involved in language - the four skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking - which have been, in the past, "treated somewhat in isolation, in fact have so much in common with each other, that it makes much more sense to treat them holistically" according to Wray & Medwell (1991). It has been noted that the links between reading and writing have been emphasized that both are now referred to as "literacy." Similarly, the term "oracy" is commonly used to denote proficiency in oral expression and comprehension.

According to the theory of Fernando, Habana and Alicia (1998), speaking, alongside listening is the first to be developed before the writing skills. It is dependent upon the number of factors such as fluency in speech, conversation, adequacy of vocabulary, articulation, and pronunciation. Speaking and writing require the use of vocabulary.

Saddler and Steve (2002) considered writing as another physical and mental activity engaged in some various purposes. It is a mental activity for it is an exercise in putting down thoughts together about a subject according to a certain method

of development. It needs a great deal of mental discipline and a consideration degree of technical know-how and creativity.

As such, speaking skill and composition writing were tested to completely measure the performance level of the 1ˢᵗ year BEEd students in JRMSU-TC in terms of language productive competency.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to investigate the relationship between the receptive and productive skills of 1ˢᵗ year Bachelor of Elementary Education students of Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Tampilisan Campus, School Year 2012-2013 which sought to determine the: 1) level of the receptive skills of 1ˢᵗ year Bachelor of Elementary Education students in terms of reading comprehension; and listening comprehension; 2) level of the productive skills of 1ˢᵗ year Bachelor of Elementary Education students in terms of writing and speaking, and; 3) significant relationship between the receptive and productive skills of the 1ˢᵗ year Bachelor of Elementary Education students.

METHODOLOGY

The researchers used the descriptive-evaluative method in this study since it tested the significant relationship in the receptive skills (reading and listening comprehension) and productive skills (writing and speaking competency) of the students. The respondents of this study were the thirty-three (33) or 50% of the sixty-five (65) total population of 1ˢᵗ year BEEd students at the College of Education of Jose Rizal Memorial State University – Tampilisan Campus, Philippines, enrolled during the School Year 2012-2013.

The four different data-gathering instruments were administered to the subjects. The recorded selection entitled, "Under Nutrition Still Afflicts Pinoy Children" was used to test their listening comprehension. A 20-item reading comprehension test was administered using the poem entitled, "The Blades of Grass" to measure the reading comprehension. A picture-cue test was utilized for the speaking test. The subjects studied the pictures and were asked later on to create a narrative story within 5 minutes. The speaking test outputs were scored using Heaton's (1988) Analytical Scoring Rubric for Speaking (www. qou.edu>issued24_2>research23); and (d) for the writing test, a composition writing test was done. The students were asked to write about their unforgettable

experience. They composed an essay of not less than 150 words for the duration of one hour. The writing test outputs were scored using the Heaton's (1988) Analytical Scoring Rubric for Writing.

The research instruments were submitted to three experts for correction and enrichment. These were pilot-tested to 10 students who were not included as subjects of the study. The results of the pilot testing were analyzed using item analysis.

The four-phase test was administered for the generation of the data. For reading and listening comprehension, the results were categorized according to its level. Each level has an equal number of items. Scores were recorded accordingly. For speaking and writing skills, the Heaton's Analytic Rubric was used in scoring. Each criterion has the same value of 6 as the highest rating and 1, the lowest. Then the result for every criterion was added and based on the result in the rating scale on determining their ability in productive skills in terms of speaking and writing.

Statistical treatments such as frequency count and mean percentage were used to identify the students' level of receptive skills. Heaton's Analytic Scoring Rubric, the range of scores, frequency count, percentage and weighted mean were used to determine the students' level of communication in productive skills. In finding out the competency level of the subjects, Likert's 5 Point Scale was employed. The multiple regression analysis was used to test the relationship between receptive and productive skills.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the level of receptive skill among the 33 1st year BEEd students in terms of reading comprehension containing four indicators, namely, creative, critical, inferential and literal. It reflects that majority of the 1st year BEEd students belong to the "creative" level with a frequency of 23 or 70%, followed by the "inferential" level with a frequency of 4 or 12%. Both "critical" and "literal" levels gained a very low percentage of 3 or 9% of each level. The result implies that most of the respondents were able to create new ideas from the given text or situation.

Table 1. Level of reading comprehension of the 1st year BEEd students

Level of Reading Comprehension	Frequency	Percentage
Creative	23	**70%**
Critical	3	9%
Inferential	4	12%
Literal	3	9%
TOTAL	**33**	**100**

This finding concurred with the study of Chiang (2016), which investigated the effects of varying text difficulty on second language reading attitudes and reading comprehension. It is based on comprehensible input hypothesis which asserts that choosing text slightly harder than the learner's current level will enhance reading comprehension. Results indicate that varied levels of difficulty levels in the reading text did not significantly affect participants' reading comprehension. Another study which confirmed the result of the present study is that of Cequena, Barrot, Gabinete, and Bolanos (2013) which investigated the relationship between college students' self-perception and actual performance in reading and writing. One finding of their study suggests that students' actual reading performance is very good as measured quantitatively through the results of their multiple-choice types of tests covering skills such as noting details, identifying word meaning, and making inferences. However, the study of Cain and Bignell (2014) opposed this finding since the standardized scores of their two-group respondents indicate that they had weak reading skills. The combined group obtained word reading accuracy and reading comprehension scores that were more than one standard deviation below the population mean (<85); the poor attention group obtained a low word reading accuracy score although it was within one standard deviation of the population mean (88.09) and their reading comprehension score was below the population mean (<85).

Table 2 presents the level of receptive skills among the 33 BEEd-I students in terms of listening comprehension. It also reflects that most of the subjects were in the "appreciative" level with 18 students or 55% from the total population. Eleven or 33% belong to "informational" level and 4 or 12% of the subjects belong to "judgmental" level.

Table 2. Level of listening comprehension of the 1ˢᵗ year BEEd students

Level of Listening Comprehension	Frequency	Percentage
Appreciative	18	**55%**
Judgmental	4	12%
Informational	11	33%
TOTAL	**33**	**100**

This means that the 1st year BEEd students are generally classified as appreciative listeners who could note details and information objectively. This implies that the students could make a judgment and evaluate situations accordingly.

This finding is contrary to the study of Graham (2006), which suggests that "listening comprehension is the skill in which students in the post-compulsory phase of education feel they have achieved the least success." The learners highlighted the main problems such as dealing adequately with the speed of delivery of texts, making out individual words in a stream of spoken French, and making sense of any words identified.

Table 3. Writing competency level of the 1ˢᵗ year BEEd students

Writing Competency Level	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	0	0%
Very Good	8	24%
Good	16	**49%**
Fair	8	24%
Poor	1	3%
Total	**33**	**100**

Table 3 reveals the level of productive skills among the 33 BEEd-I students in terms of writing competency. It can be gleaned that most of the subjects under study got a frequency of 16 or 49% described as "good" in writing. Each of the subjects classified as "very good" and "fair" got the same frequency of 8 or 24%, while only 1 or 3% is classified as "poor" in writing. This result denotes that the performance level of the subjects regarding writing skill is rated good.

The study of Al-Ahdal, Alfallaj, Al-Awaied, and Al-Hattami (2014) supported the finding of this study. They have undertaken an in-depth review of the available literature, which was followed up with modern testing methods. In

their study, they witnessed a dichotomy between speaking and writing abilities of college level young learners. The trend is towards a higher score on writing-ability tests compared to the oral language proficiency tests. However, the finding of the current research opposed the study of Khuwaileh and Shoumali (2000), which assessed the writing skills of the students in the two languages: English and Arabic, and further investigated whether there is an association between poor writing across languages. Their study confirms that poor writing in English correlates with similar deficiencies in the mother tongue which denies the common assumption in English Language Teaching (ELT), that all students are fully competent in their first language skills, is unfounded, as is much of the criticism of ELT programs for speakers of Arabic, based on poor writing skills in English. Further, Wongsothom (n.d.) found that University students had a medium-level skill in both the sound and the graphic modalities needing improvement, especially their integrative skills of reading-writing and the writing skills, which were very weak.

Table 4. Speaking competency level of the 1st year BEEd students

Speaking Competency Level	Frequency	Percentage
Excellent	0	0%
Very Good	4	12%
Good	26	**79%**
Fair	3	9%
Poor	0	0%
Total	**33**	**100**

Table 4 reveals the level of productive competence of the 1st year BEEd students regarding speaking competency. As shown in the table, the majority of the subjects got a frequency of 26 or 79% described to be "good" in speaking while 4 or 12% belong to "very good" and 3 or 9% were classified "fair," respectively. It implies that the level of performance of the subjects in terms of speaking skills is generally "good."

The result conforms to the study of Ockey, Koyama, Setoguchi, and Sun (2015), which suggests that TOEFL iBT speaking scores are good indicators of academic oral ability and that they are better measures of pronunciation, fluency and vocabulary/grammar than they are of interactional competence, descriptive skill, and presentation delivery skill. The study of Ahmed and Alamin (2014) also support the findings of this study. After examining whether the 47 university

students, who were fourth-year majoring in English literature, use features of language that indicates advanced knowledge of English in their production, numbers have shown that the level of the students is within the expected measure as far as the ESL levels are within the benchmarks of the speaking levels.

Table 5a. Relationship between writing competency and receptive skills of the BEED-I students

Receptive Skills	R	R²	B	t-value	p-value at α .05 level of significance	Interpretation
Reading			0.589	3.967	0.009	Significant
Listening	0.640	0.409	0.123	0.829	0.414	Not Significant

Dependent Variable: **Writing**

Interpretation of r – value

r – value	Interpretation
± 00	no correlation
± 0.01 - ± 0.30	negligible correlation
± 0.31 - ± 0.50	low correlation
± 0.51 - ± 0.70	moderate correlation
± 0.71 - ± 0.90	high correlation
± 0.91 - ± 0.99	veryhigh correlation
± 1.00	perfect correlation

Table 5a reflects the relationship and the degree of influence of the receptive skills such as listening and reading comprehension of the 1st year BEEd students to their writing skills. The table reveals that as to the relationship between the receptive skills with R-value of 0.640, it implies that there is moderate or marked correlation result reading 40.9% influence on their writing skills and remaining 59.1% is caused by other factors.

The figure further reveals that the t-value of 3.967 in their reading skill which is 3.967 significantly relates to their writing skill at α .05 level of significance. This means that their reading ability is a good predictor of their writing skill. This indicates that a student having good reading skill would likely do a good performance in writing. On the other hand, the listening skill of BEEd students is not a good predictor of their writing skills having the t-value of 0.829 which is insignificant at α .05 level of significance.

The result implies that the writing skills of the 1st year BEEd students are only predicted by the reading skills but not in their listening skills.

The result of the study conforms to the study of Carrell and Connor (1991) who examined reading and writing relationships in English as a second language with 33 international undergraduate and graduate students. The study found that there was a significant correlation between reading and writing in a second language. Likewise, Flahive and Bailey (1993) explored the reading and writing relationship in adult second language learners and found a significant correlation between the reading comprehension test scores and holistic scores of an argumentative essay. Newton and Moore (2010) described writing apprehension and assessed the relationships among reading and English aptitude and discipline-specific formal writing ability among undergraduate nursing students. The results indicated that both reading and English aptitude were related to students' formal writing ability. This result is further supported with Mencius' (2005) view that writing and reading is a connected process of communication between the writer and the reader. Clearly, building reading skills can contribute to the development of writing skills.

Table 5b. Relationship between speaking competency and receptive skills

Receptive Skills	R	R²	B	t-value	p-value at α .05 level of significance	Interpretation
Reading			0.260	1.392	0.174	Not Significant
	0.260	0.068				
Listening			0.001	0.005	0.996	Not Significant

Dependent Variable: **Speaking**

Interpretation of r – value

r – value	Interpretation
± 00	no correlation
± 0.01 - ± 0.30	negligible correlation
± 0.31 - ± 0.50	low correlation
± 0.51 - ± 0.70	moderate correlation
± 0.71 - ± 0.90	high correlation
± 0.91 - ± 0.99	very high correlation
± 1.00	perfect correlation

Table 5b shows the relationship of the students' speaking skill to their receptive skills. The result reveals that reading obtained t-value of 1.392 having the p-value of 0.174 and listening attained a *t*-value of 0.005 with the p-value of 0.996 which are both higher at α .05 level of significance. These mean that the

receptive skills in terms of reading and listening have no significant relationship as to their speaking skills.

The result reveals that the receptive skills such as reading and listening skills are not predictors of speaking skills. The result implies that the reading and listening skills of the students have a low or slight correlation to their speaking skills and the receptive skills only influence 7% of the variation of their speaking skills and the remaining 93% is caused by other factors. The result implies that receptive skills such as reading and listening skills of the 1st year BEEd students cannot predict their speaking abilities.

This finding opposed to Krashen's theory which claimed that listening skills would automatically apply to speaking skills. However, this is supported by Swain (1993) who hypothesizes that it is possible to have excellent listening comprehension, but poor speaking skills. Swain theorizes that there is a difference between language comprehension and production, and the two skills are separable (Hoopengarner, 2013).

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the 1st year BEEd students are well-founded in their receptive skills; they belong to creative level in reading comprehension and appreciative level in listening comprehension. The students are generally good in their productive skills or speaking and writing competencies. The students' receptive skill in reading relates significantly to their writing competency, but there is an insignificant relationship between reading and speaking as well as in listening comprehension. Since the students' performance in productive skills is only "good," teachers are encouraged to make more effort to lift them to the "excellent" level.

The findings tell us that the teacher-education students lack the productive skills in communication especially with the use of the second language, English and that teachers of English will need to help them improve their performance since these students' main business in the future is teaching in which speaking and writing are the most important skills to be successful in the field.

TRANSLATIONAL RESEARCH

The findings of the study may be best translated to workbooks or teaching manuals with varied activities that will help enhance and enrich the students' speaking and writing skills.

LITERATURE CITED

Ahmed, S. & Alamin, A. (2014). Assessing speaking ability in academic context for fourth year Taif University students. In *International Journal of English Linguistics, 4 (6), 97-103.* doi:10.5539/ijel.v4n6p97.

Al-Ahdal, A., Alfallaj, F., Al-Awaied, S., & Al-Hattami (2014). A comparative study of proficiency in speaking and writing among EFL learners in Saudi Arabia. In *American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 4 (2), 141-149.*

Alderson, J., & Banerjee, J. (2002). Language testing and assessment (part 2). *Language Teaching, 35, 79–113.*

Barnett, W. S., Yarosz, D. J., Thomas, J. H., Jung, K., & Blanco, D. (2007). Two-way monolingual English immersion in preschool education: An experimental comparison. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 22, 277–293.*

Cain, K. & Bignell (2014). Reading and listening comprehension and their relation to inattention and hyperactivity. In *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84, 108-124.* Retrieved from 5. http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=22f93f85-d249-43cb-883b-82c6030f6050%40sessionmgr4009&vid=1&hid=4114

Carrell, P. L., & Connor, U. (1991). Reading and writing descriptive and persuasive texts. Modern Language Journal, 75, 314–324.

Cequena, M. B., Barrot, J. S., Gabinete, A. L., & Bolanos, E. A. (2013). Investigating the relationship between college students' self-perception and actual performance in reading and in writing. In *Philippine ESL Journal, 11, 115-137.* Retrieved from http://www.philippine-esl-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/V11_A6.pdf

Chiang, M. (2016). Effects of varying text difficulty levels on the second language (L2) reading attitudes and reading comprehension. In *Journal of Research in Reading.* Vol. 39 Issue 4, p448-468. 21p. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9817.12049

Crystal, D. (2003). English as a Global Language, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fernando, J. N., Habana, P. I., & Alicia, C. I. (1998). *College English for today, Book 1 (Rev. ed.).* Caloocan City: National Book Store, Inc.

Flahive, D. E., & Bailey, N. H. (1993). Exploring reading/writing relationships in adult second language learners. In J. Carson and I. Leki (Eds.), Reading in the composition classroom (pp. 128–140). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Gordon, R. G., Jr. (ed.) (2005). Ethnologue: Languages of the World, 15th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International. (Electronic version: www.ethnologue.com, accessed Feb. 22, 2003)

Graham, S. (2006). Listening comprehension: The learners' perspective. In System, Vol. 34, Issue 2: 165-182. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2005.11.001

Gunning, T. G. (2005). *Creating literacy instruction for all students (5th ed.).* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching, fourth edition.* Pearson ESL.

Hoopengarner, D. (2013). *Listening and speaking online.* Retrieved from http://edu.ocac.gov.tw/discuss/academy/netedu05/html/paper/sw12.pdf

Kavaliauskiene, G. (2004). Research into reading-writing connections in ESP. *The Internet Journal 'English for Specific Purposes World'*, http://esp-world.info/Articles/GK1203.htm

Kavaliauskiene, G. & Kaminskiene, L. (2009). Proficiency in reading, writing and translation skills: ESP aspect. In *Vertimo Studijos, 2.* Retrieved from http://www.vertimostudijos.flf.vu.lt/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Vertimo_studijos_2.171-184.pdf

Krashen, S. D., Terrell, T. D., Ehrman, M. E., & Herzog, M. (1984). A theoretical basis for teaching the receptive skills. *Foreign Language*

Annals, *17*(4), 261-275. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1984.tb03226.x/abstract

Khuwaileh, A. & Shoumali, A. (2000). Writing Errors: A Study of the Writing Ability of Arab Learners of Academic English and Arabic at University. In *Journal Language, Culture and Curriculum.* Vol. 13, Issue 2: 174-183. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07908310008666597

Mencius (2005). *Theories of reading and writing in intellectual thought.* Retrieved from http://www.sunypress.edu/pdf/61096.pdf.

Meyer, C. F. (2009). *Introducing English Linguistics*. New York, United States of America: Cambridge University Press.

Newton, S. and Moore, G. (2010). Nursing Students' Reading and English Aptitudes and Their Relationship to Discipline-Specific Formal Writing Ability: A Descriptive Correlational Study. In Nursing Education Perspectives (National League for Nursing). Vol. 31 Issue 4, p221-225.

Ockey, G. J., Koyama, D., Setoguchi, E., & Sun, A. (2015). The extent to which TOEFL iBT speaking scores are associated with performance on oral language tasks and oral ability components for Japanese university students. *Language Testing*, *32*(1), 39-62. DOI:10.1177/0265532214538014

Palmer, A. (1992). Issues in evaluating input-based language teaching programs. In Alderson, J. Charles and Alan Beretta (eds) *Evaluating Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Powers, D. E. (2010). The case for a comprehensive, four-skills assessment of English-language proficiency. In *R & D Connections, No. 14*. Retrieved from https://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RD_Connections14.pdf

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1988). *Writing and reading: The transactional theory*. Retrieved from http://www.nwp.org/cs/public/download/nwp_file/127/TR13.pdf?x-r=pcfile_d

Saddler, B. & Steve, G. (2002). The relationship between writing performance among more and less skilled writers. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, V323n3 pp. 231-247.

Swain, Merrill (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The*
Canadian Modern Language Review, 50(1), 158-164.

Tejero, E. G. (2008). *Doorways to English language proficiency.* Mandaluyong City: National Book Store.

The receptive and productive skills (2013). Retrieved from (http://www.tesolcourse.com/tesol-glossary/Receptive-and-Productive-Skills/).

Wongsothom, A. (n.d.) Levels of English Skills of Thai Students. Retrieved from http://www.culi.chula.ac.th/Research/e-Journal/research_10.htm

Wray, D. & Medwell, J. (1991). *Literacy and language in the primary years.* London: Routledge.