Correlation between Productive and Receptive Language Skills: An Examination on ADFELPS Test Scores

Ella Yuzar[1]

Siti Rejeki[2]

[1] English Education Department, Ar-RaniryState Islamic University, Banda Aceh, Indonesia, ella.yuzar@uin.ar-raniry.ac.id
[2] Faculty of Arts, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, srejeki@student.unimelb.edu.au

Abstract

ADFELPS Tests has been widely used as a predictive test to help stakeholders in making decisions in levelling Indonesian defence attachés'English proficiency before they are assigned abroad. Despite the significant demands in examining the test for the purpose of informing the test users about the army officers' English competence, little research has attempted to evaluate this standardized test. The present study, therefore, aimed to analyse the connection between the receptive and productive language skills of the test. Besides, it is also keen to explore whether test takers' age, frequency of test-taking and length of study affect their scores and which part of the test is the most difficult to complete. Thirty military officers participated by submitting their ADFELPS Test scores and answered a designed questionnaire.IBM SPSS 2.5 software was used to perform a variety of analysis procedures such as the Pearson correlation analysis, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and an independent t-test procedure. It revealed a strong relationship between ADFELPS test score of language receptive skills (listening and reading) and the productive skills (speaking and writing) and listening is the dominant skill that correlates with all other language proficiency skills. Second, listening skill is particularly considered as the most difficult skill to acquire due to its complexity in the language learning process. Finally, participants' age and their experiences of taking the test do not bring a significant impact on the improvement of ADFEPLS achievement score. In contrast, length of study preparation has helped test takers in increasing their test scores.

***Keywords*:** ADFELPS Tests, Productive language skills, Receptive language skills

1. Introduction

The Australian Defence Force English Language Profiling Systems (ADFELPS) test has been used by the Indonesian Defence Language Training Centre and Indonesian defence

forces (TNI) to select the defence attachés who will be projected to be deployed to approximately forty counterpart countries. ADFELPS test is used as a diagnostic test to assess participants' English language proficiency before they enroll to Defence Attaché Candidate English Language Course. All military personnel from non-English speaking countries who are assigned to attend Australian Defence Forces (ADF) and the New Zealand Defence Forces (NZDF) courses, training, or seminars, have to take the ADFELPS test and meet the requirements needed by the target courses. The army officers must achieve ADFELPS level of 6 or above for each language skill– listening, reading, speaking and writing. According to Defence International Training Centre (2020), more than 750 Indonesian defence personnel take this test each year before they come to or after they arrive at DITC, Australia. This Defence attache Intensive English Course uses ADFELPS as the proficiency test to measure the candidates' proficiency in academic English and military English understanding which further helps them in conducting their daily tasks as Defence Attache. ADFELPS is the only standardized English test covering a military area of knowledge and expertise which has been utilized in most of the Australian and New Zealand counterpart countries.

Despite the significant use of ADFELPS test, far too little attention has been paid to examine the construct of this language test. For instance, Jeggy (2014) merely examined the obstacles thatMalaysian Armed Forces (MAF) Officers experience in ADFELPS writing test. After giving writing workshops and conducting various tests, he found that most of the officers were weak in term of grammatical accuracy and word choice skills which cause the low score for their writing tests. The present study, however, covered a wider scope of the standardized test. It attempted to investigate whether the four language skills of the test i.e. listening and reading as the receptive skills and Speaking and Writing as the productive skills are correlated. There has been a substantial amount of work that scrutinizes the connection between receptive and expressive language skills (Cheong, Zhu, & Liao, 2018; Pignot-Shahov, 2012; Anderson & Briggs, 2011; Tavares, 1990; Davies 1976). They all agreed that even though distinctions are made among language skills, for example, processing language input versus producing language output, yet the language construct is not separated. Even Davies (1976), who earlier distinguished knowledge of foreign languages into three major stages i.e. receptive reading skills, receptive aural skills and productive skills, admitted that those skills are linked and demanded for language attainment. Based on this ground, however, none of the previous studies have looked into the relationships between ADFELPS receptive and productive skills. Another equally important purpose of the research was to examine whether test takers' age, frequency of test-taking and length of study affect their scores and which part of the test is the most difficult to complete.

Thirty test takers from the Indonesian defence force who were going to be deployed between the period of 2019 and 2020 and would be posted in an English-speaking country participated in this study. The participants' ADFELPS test results were collected from the Indonesian Defence Language Training Centre, Jakarta. Questionnaires were sent to the participants for collecting the data on their perceptions about each skill of the test. The Pearson correlation and t-test were used as the analysis procedure to find the relationship among the four language skills as well as the effect of participants' age, length of the study period, and frequency of test-taking on the achievement of the ADFELPS test.To investigate

the correlation between ADFELPS productive and receptive test score and participants' age, length of study, and educational background on their ADFELPS test score, this study was guided by the following three research questions:

1. Does participants' achievement on the ADFELPS receptive skill tests correlate with their productive skill test?
2. Do age, length of the study period, and frequency of test-takingaffect the participants' achievement on the ADFELPS test?
3. Which language skill was the most difficult for the test takers?

1.1. Language Receptive and Productive Skills

In language teaching and learning as well as language assessments, there are at least two types of language skills developed namely receptive skills; the ability to comprehend and understand language code, and productive or expressive skills; the ability to express and utilize the language codes to transfer information. Laufer & Goldstein (2004) define that productive skills are commonly associated with speaking and writing while receptive skills refer to listening and reading skills. In an earlier study, Davies (1976) even classifies language skills into three stages of acquiring foreign language knowledge, separating the receptive skills into two phases. First is receptive reading skill, that is, learners' ability to comprehend various types of written texts having different levels of complexity i.e. texts which is easy to understand because it relates to readers' own knowledge or professional fields and the other texts which use connotative, deviant, social and political knowledge, etc. such as poetry and newspaper. Second is receptive aural skill or the ability to understand the spoken knowledge. Davies further explains that in most cases, this type of ability might be improved correspondingly with the reading skill. The final stage is the productive skills, that is, the ability to produce or actively communicate in the second or foreign language, both written and spoken. However, the present study focuses on the relationship between the listening and reading as the receptive skills and speaking and writing as the productive skills in language assessment.

Regarding the association of receptive and productive language skills, there might be different views on whether these types of skills are correlated with each other. Richards (2015), who investigates the key problems faced by language learners transitioning from low-intermediate to intermediate level, finds the gap between receptive skills and productive skills. He asserts that while learners' receptive competence continues to develop, their productive competence remains relatively static and language items that learners recognize and understand in the input they hear do not pass into their productive competence" (p.3). He gives a logic example of people who may understand a chronological story in a novel, but they can hardly write one. This argument is in the same veinwith Yi's (2011) notion of learners who have good language cognitive capabilities, but they cannot apply in communicative performance due to their feelings of anxiety or frustration.

In contrast, researchers such as Sakurai (2017), Šišková (2016), Kent and Wanzek (2016), and Grabe (2003) claim that language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing) are interrelated across communicative forms (receptive or productive), for instance, reading skill has been well-documented as a precursor to writing proficiency. Milton (2009)

also suggests that language learners with strong passive or receptive skills (listening and reading) may be subjected to productive knowledge as he further explains that "good passive skills often require the reader or the listener to actively anticipate the words that will occur" (p.13). In the most recent study, Pae and O'Brien (2018) conducted a study which involves 92 Korean second language speakers of English revealed that listening to a receptive skill become a dominant predictor of the results for speaking and writing test. In other words, the receptive language skills have a positive correlation towards the productive skills.

1.1.1. The Relationship Between Receptive and Productive Skills in Language Tests

Several studies have been done to investigate the relationship among language skills (reading, listening, speaking, and writing) using data from high stake language tests. Sawaki, Stricker, and Oranje (2008) examine the structure of the TOEFL iBT® test to find out whether language ability is unitary or dividable into an independent variable. By using a sample from a TOEFL iBT field trial, they did an item-level confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to identify a single higher-order general factor i.e. EFL and ESL ability and four first-order factors i.e. reading, listening, speaking, and writing. This study reveals that the integrated speaking and writing task of TOEFL iBT properly sets the targeted construct which has minimal influence of the reading and listening constructs. Additionally, the general findings conclude that language abilities are multi-componential.

Using data from 701 the International English-Language Testing System (IELTS) test takers, Bozorgian (2012) examines the relationship among the four skills of the language ability and the correlation between listening test and other macro language skills. He applies Pearson product-moment correlations and ANOVA for data analysis. The study reveals that all four language ability skills have varied correlations from moderate (reading and writing) to high (listening and reading). Also, listening skill has a strong relationship with other macro language skills.

Another study that investigates the correlation between the four language skills is conducted by Liu and Costanzo (2013). They use data from 4,935 Korean test takers who took TOEIC (Test of English for International Communication) Speaking and Writing test and TOEIC Listening and Reading test from December 2006 to December 2008. Generally, there are three main findings resulted from the study. First, they found that the four skills are moderately correlated to each other and each language skill has a particular aspect that contributes to the measurement of language abilities. As a result, having a good performance on one test does not predict similar achievement for the other TOEIC tests. Second, TOEIC Listening and Reading tests have the highest correlation with r= .726, followed by TOEIC Listening and Speaking (r=.634). This result resonates with previous studies that use data from TOEFL conducted by Hale et al. (1988) and Sawaki et al. (2008) which suggest that Listening skill is integrated with other skills such as Reading and Speaking and fundamental in foreign language acquisition. Another significant finding is that receptive skills such as Listening and Reading might bring a beneficial impact on fostering the comprehension of productive skills (Speaking and Writing).

1.1.1.1. Review of ADFELPS Test

ADFELPS test is an English language proficiency rating system developed by the Defence International Training Centre (DITC) Australia. It was first introduced in 1996 and formally used to assess the English language skills of Defence Cooperation Program (DCP) participants and to describe the levels of English required for target courses conducted by the Australian Defence Forces (ADF). The ADFELPS test is used to identify suitable participants for ADF courses, determine English language profiles for all ADF courses available to DCP personnel, and locate DCP personnel to appropriate courses, based on their English language proficiency.

Like other major language tests such as IELTS and iBT, ADFELPS focuses on four essential English-language skills namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing (Defence International Training Centre, 2020). ADFELPS listening task is divided into five graded tasks consisting of fifty items and played twice. Test takers are required to answer multiple choices, gap fillings and short answers based on a variety of spoken English such as a short and long conversation between two people and a radio program or discussion on a defence issue. The answers to the test do not require exact wordings and spelling mistakes are accepted as long as they do not obscure meaning. The ADFELPS speaking test consists of an interview that is broken up into five phases. It involves greeting, telling basic personal information, and responding to simple questions which then continue with explaining familiar topics, role play-information gathering, and stating an opinion on a particular subject. The topics are mostly related to military or defence. Both listening and speaking tests take approximately forty minutes and twenty minutes respectively.

ADFELPS reading test is designed to measure test takers' ability in understanding written English. Test takers are asked to answer five graded tasks consisting of fifty question types that include multiple choice, matching vocabulary and short answer questions. The reading test takes approximately one hour to complete. Finally, ADFELPS writing test aims to measure person's ability to use written English to perform communication in daily life and military workplace. The test is divided into two types of tasks. The task one requires participants to write at least 120 words on simple military topics and task two asks participants to write at least 200 words on a given issue. A set of prompt questions are given for the test takers to generate ideas. The allocated time for the writing test is twenty minutes for task one and forty minutes for task two. ADFELPS is assessed using the analytic procedure, hence, for rubric of measurement, the test uses a 1-9 band scale.

Unlike other major language tests that have been extensively researched, no previous study has investigated ADFELPS test especially the correlation between its productive and receptive language skill test. Until recently, the results of the participants' achievements in ADFELPS tests were only internally discussed at DITC and among the users of the ADFELPS test during the annual Commanding Officers Regional English Language Schools (CORELS). Therefore, the current study attempts to quantitatively analyse the relationship among the four language skills of ADFELPS test on the account of receptive and productive skills. Additionally, it seeks to examine whether age, length of the studyperiod and frequency of test-taking affect the test achievement results.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

A total of thirty male participants from the Indonesian defence personnel took part in this study.They were going to be assigned as Defence Attache in thirty different counterpart countries. Most of the participants, 63% of the total, have been serving in the military for more than 21 years and the other 27% has been serving between 15 to 20 years. Based on the age interval, the participantswere divided into two groups. The first group consists 17 participants whose ages range between 41 to 45 years old and the other 13 participants whose ages were above 46 years old were classified in the second group. Some of them have taken the test more than twice prior to data collection. The participants' educational backgrounds varied from Army, Air Force, and Naval Academy with only 2 of them werefrom officer's recruit.

2.2. Instruments

As part of ethical consideration, all test takers involved were informed about the research and the data collection began after they all agreed to participate. The ADFELPS test results were collected from the Indonesian Defence Language Training Centre (IDLTC) where the participants took the final test at the end of their Defence Attache English Language Course in their home country. Data from 30 participants' ADFELPS score result was sent via email. Next, a set of questionnaires were administered to the participants with a help of a colleague. The questionnaire items aimed to collect further information on participants' profiles, number of test completions, allocated study time, and their perception on ADFELPS tests. We requested a class session for students to fulfil the questionnaire that was sent via email. All the data including questionnaire answer sheets were obtained through emails in two weeks time.

2.4. Data Analysis Procedures

Data gathered from test takers' ADFELPS scores and questionnaire answers were processed using the latest version of IBM SPSS 2.5 software. The different analysis procedures were conducted to address the research questions. Following Liu and Costanzo (2013), the Pearson correlation analysis was used to measure the relationship among the four language skills. Next, to analyse the impact of length of study period on test takers' score in research question two, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was utilised to compare the mean scores of the participants. This analysis procedure was used because we need to compare the means of the participants who were divided into three groups i.e. no preparation group, 1-2 months preparation group, and more than 3 months preparation group. Finally, an independent t-test procedure was run to find whether age and frequency of test-taking influence the participants' achievement scores.

3. Finding and Discussion

3.1. Research Question 1

Pearson Correlation was run to measure the relationship between ADFELPS productive and receptive skill test scores.The test measures the correlation between listening test as the first receptive skill and speaking test as the first productive skill; followed by the correlation between reading test as the second receptive skill and writing as the second productive skill.

Table 1. The correlation between the receptive and the productive language skills on ADFELPS test

		Listening	Speaking	Reading	Writing
Listening	Pearson Correlation	1	.742**	.724**	.557**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.001
	N	30	30	30	30
Speaking	Pearson Correlation	.742**		.706**	.590**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.001
	N	30	30	30	30
Reading	Pearson Correlation	.724**	.706**	1	.788**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	30	30	30	30
Writing	Pearson Correlation	.557**	.590**	.788**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.000	
	N	30	30	30	30

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

Table 1 presents the results of the correlations analysis which provides a significant positive correlation between Listening test and Speaking test ($r = .742$; $p<.001$) and the significant positive correlation between Reading test and Writing test ($r = .788$; $p<.001$). Following Roever and Phakiti (2018), these correlations are interpreted as strong correlations between ADFELPS productive skills and receptive skill tests.Based on the result above, the Coefficient of Determination of listening and speaking test has an R^2 of 55%, while reading and writing has R^2 of 62%. Those numbers show how the language skill pairs can be overlapped between each other. In other words, participants who scored higher on the receptive skill tests have a considerable probability to also score higher on the productive skill tests and otherwise.

3.2. Research Question 2

To seek whether age and frequency of test-taking might affect the participants' test score, an independent t-test analysis procedure was utilized. We divided the participants into two group, i.e. one group of 41-45 years old and the other group of above 46 years old for participants' age analysis, and one group of those who have taken the test only once and the other group of those who have taken the test 2-3 times before data collection for the frequency of test-taking analysis. Regarding the length of study preparation, we analysed the data by using ANOVA because the participants are divided into three groups, i.e. no preparation, 1-2-month preparation, and 3-or-more month preparation group.

Table 2. The effect of participants' age on their achievement on the test

Group Statistics

	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Listening test score	41-45	17	62.9412	8.48875	2.05882
	>46	13	63.0769	10.31553	2.86101
Reading test score	41-45	17	70.0000	8.66025	2.10042
	>46	13	70.7692	6.40513	1.77646
Writing test score	41-45	17	67.0588	8.48875	2.05882
	>46	13	65.3846	6.60225	1.83114
Speaking test score	41-45	17	65.8824	10.03670	2.43426
	>46	13	65.3846	6.60225	1.83114

Table 2 presents the group descriptive statistics of the age of the participants measured using Independent Sample T-test. The outcome of measurement shows that differences in the mean score between age groups do not significantly describe the influence of age on the participants' achievement of each ADFELPS test. It can be observed that mean score between the group is barely divergent, meaning that the older participants might have the same chance to get a higher score as the younger participants.

Table 3. The effect of participants' age on their achievement on the test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Listening test score	Equal variances assumed	.604	.444	-.040	28	.969	-.135	3.432	-7.166	6.894
	Equal variances not assumed			-.039	23.017	.970	-.135	3.524	-7.427	7.155
Reading test score	Equal variances assumed	2.651	.115	-.269	28	.790	-.769	2.864	-6.636	5.098
	Equal variances not assumed			-.280	27.985	.782	-.769	2.750	-6.404	4.865
Writing test score	Equal variances assumed	.716	.405	.587	28	.562	1.674	2.850	-4.164	7.513
	Equal variances not assumed			.608	27.980	.548	1.674	2.755	-3.970	7.318
Speaking test score	Equal variances assumed	2.859	.102	.155	28	.878	.497	3.217	-6.092	7.087
	Equal variances not assumed			.163	27.493	.871	.497	3.046	-5.747	6.742

Table 3 provides the outcome of T-Test measurement reporting that age of the participants had no significantly greater impact on the participants' four ADFELPS skill tests. As the scores can be seen as follows; listening score ($t_{(28)}$ = 0.40,p>0.01),reading score($t_{(28)}$ = .269,p>0.01),writing score ($t_{(28)}$ = .587,p>0.01) and speaking test score ($t_{(28)}$ = .155, p>0.01). It can be concluded that none of the results of t-test for the language skills seems to be significant and it is positively confirmed that age differences do not affect the score achievements.

Table 4. The effect of participants' frequency of test-taking on their achievement on the test

Group Statistics					
	how many times had you taken ADFELPS test before you passed the test?	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Listening test score	once	19	59.4737	7.05036	1.61746
	2-3 times	11	69.0909	9.43880	2.84590
Reading test score	once	19	67.3684	7.33493	1.68275
	2-3 times	11	75.4545	5.22233	1.57459
Writing test score	once	19	64.7368	7.72328	1.77184
	2-3 times	11	69.0909	7.00649	2.11254
Speaking test score	once	19	64.2105	9.61237	2.20523
	2-3 times	11	68.1818	6.03023	1.81818

Table 4 presents the group descriptive statistics of participants' frequency of test-taking measured byusing independent sample T-test. It shows that difference in the mean score between 'once' group and '2-3 time' group is only obvious for reading test score (mean score of once the group is 67.3684- and 2-3-times group is 75.4545). The other three ADFELPS test scores do not show much diversion between test scores to describe the influence of test-taking frequency to the participants' score.It can be concluded that the more frequent test-taking does not guarantee for higher ADFELPS scores.

Table 5. The effect of participants' frequency of test-taking on their achievement on the test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
						Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df				Lower	Upper
Listening test score	Equal variances assumed	.774	.386	-3.179	28	.004	-9.617	3.025	-15.814	-3.419
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.938	16.545	.009	-9.617	3.273	-16.538	-2.696
Reading test score	Equal variances assumed	1.267	.270	-3.206	28	.003	-8.086	2.522	-13.253	-2.919
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.509	26.606	.002	-8.086	2.304	-12.817	-3.354
Writing test score	Equal variances assumed	1.008	.324	-1.537	28	.135	-4.354	2.832	-10.155	1.447
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.579	22.761	.128	-4.354	2.757	-10.061	1.352
Speaking test score	Equal variances assumed	5.136	.031	-1.232	28	.228	-3.971	3.223	-10.574	2.631
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.389	27.727	.176	-3.971	2.858	-9.828	1.885

Table 5 shows the outcome of Independent Sample T-Test measurement, reporting that participants' test-taking frequency had no significantly greater impact on the participants' ADFELPS skill test achievements. As it can be seen only listening and reading score who have significant value,($t_{(28)}$= 3.179,p<0.01) and ($t_{(28)}$ = 3.206, p<0.01) respectively. Using online Becker's calculator, the effect size is considered large as cohen'dis 1.15 for listening and 1.27 for reading. Therefore, the frequency of test-taking seems to contribute to a statistically significant difference for participants' listening and reading test score.However,

the scores for writing and speaking are not influenced by test-taking frequency as it can be seen that,writing score ($t_{(28)} = 1.537$, $p>0.01$) and speaking test score ($t_{(28)} = 1.232$, $p>0.01$).

For the purpose of analysing the length of study preparation, those 30 participants were divided into three groups namely:no preparation group, 1-2 month preparation group, more than 3-month preparation group. We run one-way ANOVAlike to investigate whether there was any significant difference between groups based on their length of preparation.

Table 6. The effect of length of study preparation on their achievement on the test

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Listening	no preparation	9	53.3333	5.00000	1.66667
	1-2 months	10	61.0000	3.16228	1.00000
	3 months or more	11	72.7273	4.67099	1.40836
	Total	30	63.0000	9.15386	1.67126
Reading	no preparation	9	63.3333	5.00000	1.66667
	1-2 months	10	68.0000	4.21637	1.33333
	3 months or more	11	78.1818	4.04520	1.21967
	Total	30	70.3333	7.64890	1.39649
Writing	no preparation	9	60.0000	5.00000	1.66667
	1-2 months	10	65.0000	5.27046	1.66667
	3 months or more	11	72.7273	6.46670	1.94978
	Total	30	66.3333	7.64890	1.39649
Speaking	no preparation	9	56.6667	7.07107	2.35702
	1-2 months	10	66.0000	5.16398	1.63299
	3 months or more	11	72.7273	4.67099	1.40836
	Total	30	65.6667	8.58360	1.56714

Table 6 presents the descriptive performance of participants in each group in which their scores are higher when the length of preparation are longer. The score increases significantly as it can be seen from the mean score for each test items. For listening test score, for example, no-preparation group achieves mean score of 53.33, but later the mean score increases into 61.00 with 1-2 month-preparation group.As expected, the highest number was reach by themore-than-3-month-preparation group with the mean score of 72.72.

Table 7. The effect of length of study on their achievement on the ADFELPS test

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Listening test score	Between Groups	1921.818	2	960.909	51.054	.000
	Within Groups	508.182	27	18.822		
	Total	2430.000	29			
Reading test score	Between Groups	1173.030	2	586.515	30.242	.000
	Within Groups	523.636	27	19.394		
	Total	1696.667	29			
Writing test score	Between Groups	828.485	2	414.242	12.883	.000
	Within Groups	868.182	27	32.155		
	Total	1696.667	29			
Speaking test score	Between Groups	1278.485	2	639.242	20.112	.000
	Within Groups	858.182	27	31.785		
	Total	2136.667	29			

Table 7 shows that there is a statistically significant difference between groups for each test skill. For listening test score, F (2,27)= 51.054; effect size $\eta^2 = 0,79$. This means that 79

% of the variance is due to the factor "groups"; this effect size is considered high, therefore, the longer the preparation period, the better the results of participants in the listening test. While for reading test score, F(2,27)= 30.242, effect size $\eta^2 = 0.69$; this value means that 69% of the variance is due to the factor 'groups' where the longer the length of preparation for reading test, the higher score it would be. Writing test score, F(2,27)=12.883, effect size η^2 =0.49, this effect size is considered moderate to high, in which 49 % of the variance is due to 'groups'. Coordinated with the previous skills, the longer the length of preparation for writing test, the higher the score would likely be. The last item influenced by the length of preparation is speaking test score, where the value of F(2,27)= 20.112 and effect size η^2 = 0.59. this means that 59 % of the variance is due to 'groups', where the longer the length of preparation for speaking test, the higher the score would be.

Based on the Schefféпost hoc result table, the group that has the most significant difference towards the others is the 3 more-month group. It is not surprising that there is a statistically significant difference among the more-than-3-month group, the no-preparation and 1-2-month groups in all four skills. The complete results of the significance values are displayed in the table below.

Table 8. Details of Post hoc test

Dependent Variables	(I) How long did you prepare before taking the ADFELPStest?	(J) How long did you prepare before taking the ADFELPS test?	Sig.
Listening test score	more-than-3 month	a month	.000
		1-2 months	.000
Reading test score	more-than-3 month	a month	.000
		1-2 months	.000
Writing test score	more-than-3 month	a month	.000
		1-2 months	.016
Speaking	more-than-3 month	a month	.000
		1-2 months	.037

3.3. Research Question 3

Tables 9 presents the means of four ADFELPS tests that participants achieved. The highest score was on the ADFELPS reading test, followed by writing, and speaking. It is evident that, on average, participants have the lowest score on the listening test. This result is coordinated with the data collected from the questionnaire, in which participants respond that listening test is the most difficult test for them. The descriptive statistics of participants' responses on the questionnaires can be seen in Table 10. The responses were coded as the following: 1 very easy, 2 easy, difficult, 4 very difficult. In sum, listening was considered the most difficult test by the majority of the participants as it has the highest mean score on the test difficulty question.

Table 9. Descriptive statistics of the four skills of ADFELPS

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Listening test score	30	50.00	80.00	63.0000	9.15386

Reading test score	30	60.00	80.00	70.3333	7.64890
Writing test score	30	50.00	80.00	66.3333	7.64890
Speaking test score	30	50.00	80.00	65.6667	8.58360
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 10. Descriptive statistics of participants' response to test difficulty

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
listening test	30	2.00	4.00	3.3667	.61495
reading test	30	2.00	3.00	2.6333	.49013
writing test	30	2.00	3.00	2.5333	.50742
speaking test	30	2.00	4.00	3.0333	.49013
Valid N (listwise)	30				

4. Discussion

Based on the participants' ADFELPS result scores that show the strong positive relationship among the four language skills, the present study substantiated that receptive language skills (listening and reading) in the standardised test construct are correlated with the productive language skills (speaking and writing). It can be most likely assumed that the proficiency level of receptive skills can predict that of productive skills. Also, learning receptive language skills, such as reading and listening, might support learners in their comprehension of expressive language skills. These findings are in line with other previous studies such as Bozorgian (2012), Liu and Costanzo (2013), and Pae and O'Brien (2018) who revealed that language receptive skills, such as listening and reading, might become contributing factors for successfully acquiring speaking and writing abilities as the productive skills. It might be due to the reason that, as second language learners have the ability to listen and read in another language, they are able the recall the knowledge or cognitive input for the language production process. In addition, the result had resonated with Krashen's (1982) claim that the ability of productive language skills will naturally increase as the receptive language skills are fostered.

Also, the study affirmed that listening skill is parallel with other language skills in ADFELPS test with an unexpected medium to strong correlation i.e. listening and writing (r = .55) and reading and listening (r = .72). Confirming Bozorgian' (2012a) study, listening skills proves to have strong correlations with all other macro language skills. This finding supports Bozorgian's (2012b) and Gilbert's (2005) assertations that listening skill becomes the most essential element for the improvement of other macro skills and has a crucial contribution to language learning. Nevertheless, the study also found that test takers perceived listening as the most difficult skill to acquire. It is no surprise for Bozorgian (2012b) who also reveals the similar result from his study which involves 1800 Iranian IELTS test takers' score. He claims that "listening comprehension is the primary channel of learning a language, but it is often difficult and inaccessible for second and foreign language learners due to its implicit process" (p.657).

Regarding the length of study preparation, it is evident that the allocated time for study has a highly significant impact on the test takers' ADFELPS achievement scores. The

intensive course that the participants took proves to be effective in supporting their test results. It might be because, during the intensive language course, the participants obtain more English language exposure, drills, and sufficient learning supports such as quality teachers and access to learning resources, confirming Fernández and Schmitt(2015) that language exposure is significant for L2 achievement. Furthermore, a strong instrumental motivation, for example in this case, job requirement, opportunity to be posted overseas and promotion for higher rank or position, might play an essential role in order to maintain focus on language learning and achievement. Based on Dörnyei's(1994) assertion and the result of You and Dörnyei's (2016) study, instrumental motivation can become a strong influence in driving language learners in learning a language. However, interestingly, participants' age and their frequency of taking the test do not show a significant impact on the ADFELPS result score. In this particular case, only the scores on the receptive skills improved by the more frequent experience of taking the test.

The results of the study have informed language educators that receptive language skills may become a fundamental contribution in the improvement of language competence, and it serves as an instrumental support to improve productive skills through learning and training. For language test takers, this paper suggests that an effective length of study preparation could support learners in increasing their language proficiency test scores. However, further research using larger sample should be conducted as this study collected the data only from Indonesian participants. Thus, the result cannot be generalized to ADFELPS test administered in other countries. The other studies should also analyse the test by examining the tasks and question items to determine whether the language construct is well-represented. Finally, the scores gathered for this research are only taken from male test takers. Further research should be conducted by involving a larger number of participants with a more variety of participants' gender, nationalities, educational background, etc.

5. Conclusion

This study notes several conclusions drawn from the results. First, there is a strong relationship between ADFELPS test score of language receptive skills (listening and reading) and the productive skills (speaking and writing). Also, listening skill becomes the dominant skill that correlates with all other language proficiency skills. Second, even though listening skills have likely a major contribution to language learning, it is still considered as the most difficult skill to acquire due to its complexity in the language learning process. After all, age and frequency of taking the test do not cause a significant impact on the improvement of ADFEPLS achievement scores. On the other hand, length of study preparation could help test takers in increasing their test scores.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express a deepest gratitude for the military personnel who have been willing to participate in this research study. The authors were self-funded and received no financial support for the data collection process.

References

Anderson, N. L., & Briggs, C. (2011). Reciprocity between reading and writing: Strategic processing as common ground. *The Reading Teacher*, *64*(7), 546-549.

Bozorgian, H. (2012a). Listening skill requires a further look into second/foreign language learning. ISRN Education, Vol. 2012, Article ID 810129 doi:10.5402/2012/810129

Bozorgian, H. (2012b). The relationship between listening and other language skills in International English Language Testing System. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(4), 657-663.

Cheong, C. M., Zhu, X., & Liao, X. (2018). Differences between the relationship of L1 learners' performance in integrated writing with both independent listening and independent reading cognitive skills. *Reading and Writing*, *31*(4), 779-811.

Davies, N. (1976). Receptive versus Productive Skills in Foreign Language Learning. *The Modern Language Journal, 60*(8), 440-443. doi:10.2307/326052

Defence International Training Centre. (2020, April 22). Defence International Training Centre. https://ditc.com.au/

Dörnyei, Z. (1994). Motivation and motivating in the foreign language classroom. *The modern language journal*, *78*(3), 273-284.

Fernández, B. G., & Schmitt, N. (2015). How much collocation knowledge do L2 learners have? The effects of frequency and amount of exposure. *ITL-International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 166*(1), 94-126.

Gilbert, M. B. (2005). An examination of listening effectiveness of educators: Performance and preference. Professional Educator, 27(1/2), 1-16

Grabe, W. (2003). Reading and writing relations: Second language perspectives on research and practice. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 242–262). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, G. A., Stansfield, C. W., Rock, D. A., Hicks, M. M., Butler, F. A., &Oller, J. W., Jr. (1988). *Multiple-choice Cloze items and the Test of English as a Foreign Language* (TOEFL Research Report No. 26). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Hye K. Pae& Beth O'Brien (2018) Overlap and Uniqueness: Linguistic Componential Traits Contributing to Expressive Skills in English as a Foreign Language, *Reading Psychology*, 39(4), 384-412, DOI: 10.1080/02702711.2018.1443298

Jeggy, S. S. (2014). Assessing the Writing Levels of Malaysian Armed Forces Officers Based on the ADFELPS Writing Scale. *Journal of Social Science Research*, *5*(3), 844-849.

Kent, S. C., &Wanzek, J. (2016). The relationship between component skills and writing quality and production across developmental levels: A meta-analysis of the last 25 years. *Review of Educational Research, 86*, 570-601.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Liu, J., & Costanzo, K. (2013). The relationship among TOEIC listening, reading, speaking, and writing skills. *The research foundation for the TOEIC tests: A compendium of studies*, *2*, 2-1.

Milton, J. (2009). *Measuring second language vocabulary acquisition*. Multilingual Matters.

Pae, H. K., & O'Brien, B. (2018). Overlap and Uniqueness: Linguistic Componential Traits Contributing to Expressive Skills in English as a Foreign Language. *Reading Psychology*, *39*(4), 384-412.

Richards, Jack. (2015). *Bridging the gap between receptive and productive competence.* Retrieved from http://www.cambridge.org/elt/blog/2015/08/27/bridging-gap-receptive-productive-competence/

Roever, C., &Phakiti, A. (2018). *Quantitative methods for second language research: A problem-solving approach*. Routledge.

Sakurai, N. (2017). The Relationship between the Amount of Extensive Reading and the Writing Performance. *Reading Matrix: An International Online Journal*, *17*(2), 142-164.

Sawaki, Y., Stricker, L., &Oranje, A. (2008). Factor structure of the TOEFL® Internet-based test (iBT): exploration in a field trial sample. *ETS Research Report Series*, *2008*(1).

Šišková, Z. (2016). The relationship between receptive and productive vocabulary of Slavic EFL learners. *Topics in Linguistics*, *17*(2), 26-40.

Tavares, R. R. (1990). The connection between reading and writing: theoretical foundations and some techniques. *Fragmentos: Revista de Lingua e LiteraturaEstrangeiras*, *3*(2).

Yi, F. (2011). Plateau of EFL learning: A psycholinguistic and pedagogical study. *Retrieved from*http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.565.6275&rep=rep1&type=pdf.

You, C. J., &Dörnyei, Z. (2016). Language learning motivation in China: Results of a large-scale stratified survey. *Applied Linguistics*, *37*(4), 495-519.