

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70747/cr.v5i1.861>

Listening skills and Vocabulary acquisition among 10th-grade English as a Foreign Language Learners, school year 2025-2026

Adriana Elizabeth Cango Patiño

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3073-477X>

adriana.cango@unl.edu.ec

Universidad Nacional de Loja. Maestría en Pedagogía del Inglés Como Lengua Extranjera.
Facultad de Educación, el Arte y la Comunicación. Grupo de Investigación InnoTEFL
Loja - Ecuador

Thalía Valeria Ocampo Arévalo

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-8048-0882>

thalia.ocampo@unl.edu.ec

Universidad Nacional de Loja. Maestría en Pedagogía del Inglés Como Lengua Extranjera.
Facultad de Educación, el Arte y la Comunicación.
Loja - Ecuador

Angélica Natalí Muñoz Alvarez

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7312-5830>

angelica.munoz@unl.edu.ec

Universidad Nacional de Loja. Maestría en Pedagogía del Inglés Como Lengua Extranjera.
Facultad de Educación, el Arte y la Comunicación.
Azogues - Ecuador

Jocelyn Andrea Lojan Caicedo

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1210-7419>

jocelyn.lojan@unl.edu.ec

Universidad Nacional de Loja. Maestría en Pedagogía del Inglés Como Lengua Extranjera.
Facultad de Educación, el Arte y la Comunicación.
Marcabeli - Ecuador

ABSTRACT

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, listening comprehension and vocabulary knowledge are closely connected skills that support learners' access to meaningful input. This study examined the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition among tenth-grade EFL learners at a private fiscomisional institution in Loja, Ecuador. A quantitative, cross-sectional correlational design was applied with a sample of 20 students. Data were collected through two CEFR-aligned achievement tests at the A2+ level, selected to match the national curriculum standards for this grade. Listening performance was evaluated through four subskills: understanding the speaker's purpose, making inferences from context, processing connected speech, and recognizing specific information. Vocabulary knowledge was assessed across the dimensions of form, meaning, and use. The results revealed moderate performance in both variables, defined as scores falling within the 60-75% range of the predetermined assessment scale, with greater difficulty observed in inferential listening and semantic depth. A Pearson correlation analysis showed a statistically significant positive relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition ($r=.612, p<.01$), indicating that students with stronger vocabulary knowledge tended to demonstrate higher listening comprehension. These findings highlight the importance of integrating vocabulary development within listening instruction to enhance overall communicative competence.

Keywords: *listening skills, vocabulary acquisition, efl learners*

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

The Editor and the Reviewers declared no conflict of interest.

License: 



Habilidades de Comprensión Auditiva y Adquisición de Vocabulario en Estudiantes de Décimo Año de Inglés Como Lengua Extranjera, Año Escolar 2025–2026.

RESUMEN

En los contextos de inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL), las habilidades de comprensión auditiva y el conocimiento de vocabulario constituyen competencias interrelacionadas que facilitan el acceso al aporte lingüístico. Este estudio analizó la relación entre las habilidades de comprensión auditiva y la adquisición de vocabulario en estudiantes de décimo año de EFL de una institución fiscomisional privada de Loja, Ecuador. Se empleó un diseño cuantitativo, transversal y correlacional con una muestra de 20 estudiantes. Los datos se recolectaron mediante dos pruebas alineadas al nivel A2+ del Marco Común Europeo de Referencia para las Lenguas (MCER), seleccionadas por su correspondencia con el currículo nacional. El desempeño en comprensión auditiva se evaluó a través de cuatro subhabilidades: comprensión del propósito del hablante, realización de inferencias a partir del contexto, procesamiento del habla conectada y reconocimiento de información específica. El vocabulario se evaluó considerando sus componentes de forma, significado y uso. Los resultados evidenciaron un rendimiento moderado en ambas variables, definido este como el logro de puntajes situados en el rango intermedio (60-75%) de la escala de evaluación predeterminada, observándose mayores dificultades en la comprensión inferencial y la profundidad semántica. El análisis de correlación de Pearson reveló una relación positiva y estadísticamente significativa entre la comprensión auditiva y el conocimiento de vocabulario ($r=.612, p<.01$), lo que sugiere que un mayor dominio léxico favorece la comprensión del discurso oral

Palabras clave: *habilidades de comprensión auditiva, adquisición de vocabulario, estudiantes de efl*

Los autores declaran no tener conflicto de intereses.

El Editor y los Revisores declararon no tener conflicto de intereses.

Licencia: 



INTRODUCTION

Listening has long been recognized as a central component of second language learning because it provides learners with access to meaningful input and facilitates the development of additional linguistic skills (Alqahtani, 2015). Contemporary perspectives view listening not as a passive activity but as an active and interpretive process that involves decoding, prediction, monitoring, and the integration of contextual cues. In the English as a Foreign Language context, learners often rely on classroom exposure as their primary source of auditory input, making listening instruction especially relevant in countries such as Ecuador.

In parallel with listening, vocabulary acquisition plays an essential role in language development. Without sufficient lexical knowledge, learners struggle to process and interpret oral messages effectively (El-Dakhs, 2020). Vocabulary enables learners to detect word boundaries, infer meaning, and construct coherent interpretations of spoken discourse. However, research has shown that many EFL students at the basic and intermediate levels exhibit limited vocabulary breadth and depth, which affects their ability to comprehend authentic speech (Laufer & Ravenhorst, 2020).

In Ecuador, despite several years of mandatory English instruction, persistent challenges remain in the development of listening comprehension and vocabulary knowledge. These difficulties are visible even among adolescents who have received continuous instruction but still demonstrate limited inferential comprehension, restricted vocabulary depth, and reduced exposure to naturalistic input. These contextual needs justify further research exploring how both skills interact within secondary education settings.

Empirical studies have consistently shown positive correlations between vocabulary knowledge and listening comprehension, suggesting that lexical knowledge enhances learners' ability to process spoken language (Mclean & Rouault, 2017). Thus far, most of this research has been conducted outside Latin America, and there is limited evidence involving

Ecuadorian fiscomisional institutions. These schools represent a unique hybrid model in the national context; while they are privately managed (often by religious or social missions), they receive state funding for teacher salaries and operational costs, making them accessible to middle and low-income families. Consequently, they differ from purely public and private schools in instructional time, student demographics, and educational priorities, offering a distinct pedagogical environment for EFL research.

For this reason, the present study investigates the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition among tenth-grade learners in Loja. Specifically, it aims to: (1) identify strengths and weaknesses in listening comprehension; (2) measure vocabulary knowledge considering form, meaning, and use; and (3) determine the correlation between both variables. Understanding the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition can support teachers in designing pedagogical strategies that integrate both components more effectively and promote meaningful communication. Building on this perspective, the first variable examined in this study is listening skills in English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Listening is no longer viewed as the simple decoding of auditory input. Instead, it is understood as a complex cognitive and metacognitive process. Contemporary research suggests that listeners actively construct meaning by combining acoustic signals with prior knowledge, strategic monitoring, and contextual information. As Milton and Roche (2020) mention, in second language learning, comprehension emerges from the interaction between bottom-up processes, such as phonological decoding, and top-down processes, including prediction and the activation of schematic knowledge. Consequently, effective listening requires the coordination of multiple subskills that allow learners to interpret spoken language in real time.

Listening plays a central role in EFL learning because it represents the primary source of linguistic input and strongly influences the development of other language skills.

Through exposure to oral input, learners expand their vocabulary, refine phonological representations, and become familiar with the prosodic and discourse features of natural speech. Moreover, exposure to connected speech supports both comprehension and production, as learners gradually internalize conventional patterns of language use (Schmitt & Schmitt, 2020).

In this study, listening comprehension is operationalized through four subskills. First, understanding the speaker's purpose enables learners to identify communicative intentions such as requesting, informing, or persuading. This ability supports top-down processing and contributes to overall comprehension. Research indicates that explicit instruction focusing on pragmatic cues and discourse markers can significantly enhance learners' ability to interpret meaning beyond the literal level (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).

Second, making inferences from context involves drawing on linguistic cues, background knowledge, and situational information to fill gaps in meaning. This process is closely related to vocabulary knowledge and metacognitive regulation and often poses challenges for lower-proficiency learners (Wallace, 2022). A third subskill, recognizing connected speech, refers to the ability to perceive phonological features such as reductions and assimilations that characterize natural spoken English. These features frequently hinder comprehension for EFL learners, particularly at lower proficiency levels. However, empirical evidence supports the effectiveness of explicit instruction in improving learners' sensitivity to connected speech (Zhang & Yuan, 2021).

Following Wallace and Lee (2020) thought, identifying specific information, including numbers, names, and time references, is essential for completing functional listening tasks. They suggest that this subskill is commonly targeted in instructional sequences designed for A2 learners and is generally more accessible than inferential listening. Together, these four subskills constitute the operational definition of listening used in the present study.

On the other hand, González (2022) emphasizes that extensive research has highlighted the fundamental role of vocabulary acquisition in supporting comprehension and production across all language skills. Current scholarship further conceptualizes vocabulary knowledge as a multidimensional construct encompassing form, meaning, and use. Meanwhile, Laufer and Ravenhorst (2010) state that, the dimension of form includes knowledge of spoken form, written form, and word parts. Spoken form involves recognizing words in oral input and producing them accurately, a skill influenced by phonemic awareness, syllable structure, and stress patterns. written form refers to accurate spelling and orthographic representation, which depend on phonological, orthographic, and morphological awareness. In addition, knowledge of stems and affixes allows learners to infer meanings and recognize word families, thereby facilitating vocabulary expansion.

The dimension meaning includes the connection between form and meaning, the concepts associated with a word, and the semantic relationships linking it to other lexical items. Awareness of multiple meanings is particularly important in English, where many words are polysemous or homonymous and vary according to educational context. Furthermore, semantic associations such as synonymy, hyponymy, meronymy, and antonymy contribute to deeper lexical knowledge and more efficient retrieval during communication (Schmitt & Schmitt (2020). Finally, the dimension of use encompasses grammatical behavior, collocations, and pragmatic constraints. Knowing a word involves understanding how it functions syntactically and which combinations are conventional or natural in English. Collocational knowledge, in particular, has been shown to correlate strongly with fluency and accuracy in language use. In addition, pragmatic norms influence when certain lexical choices are appropriate, emphasizing the sociocultural dimension of vocabulary use (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).Bringing these perspectives together, a substantial body of research confirms a robust and reciprocal relationship between listening and vocabulary

development. Meta-analytic findings demonstrate moderate to strong correlations between vocabulary knowledge and L2 listening comprehension, with phonological vocabulary, the knowledge of spoken forms emerging as a stronger predictor of listening than orthographic vocabulary (Zhang & Yuan, 2021).

In EFL contexts where authentic input is often scarce, integrating listening instruction with lexical development is a pedagogical necessity for improving learners' communicative effectiveness. This research justifies the joint examination of these two areas by aligning with Sustainable Development Goal 4 (Quality Education) and the Plan Nacional "Ecuador No Se Detiene," both of which emphasize enhancing human talent through high-quality, equitable instruction. Furthermore, the study is firmly rooted in the InnoTefl research group's objectives and the specific research lines of the Master's program, ensuring that the investigation not only meets international academic standards but also addresses the localized needs for innovation in English language teaching and learning.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study adopted a quantitative approach, relying on numerical data from standardized tests to examine the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition. Creswell and Creswell (2023) state that quantitative methods enable researchers to measure linguistic performance objectively and determine the strength of associations between variables. Furthermore, the research employed a non-experimental, correlational, and cross-sectional design. This design was considered more appropriate than experimental alternatives because the study did not aim to manipulate instructional conditions or implement interventions, but rather to observe naturally occurring relationships between variables in an authentic educational context (Cohen et al., 2024). Similarly, a longitudinal design was not selected, as the primary objective was not to track developmental changes over time, but to obtain an immediate and contextualized understanding of students'

performance (Khajavy & Aghaee, 2023). This design is suitable for identifying statistical associations among educational variables without altering classroom dynamics. The cross-sectional nature of the study allowed data to be collected at a single point in time, providing a clear snapshot of students' performance in both linguistic domains (Pizarro & Aulestia, 2025). The study was carried out in a private fiscomisional institution in Loja, Ecuador, during the 2024–2025 academic year. The participants consisted of 20 tenth-grade students aged 15 to 16, whose English proficiency ranged from A1 to A2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). The sample was selected through purposive sampling, a non-probability technique that involves choosing participants based on characteristics relevant to the research objectives. Although the sample size is relatively small, it is justified by the exploratory nature of the study and the accessibility of a specific educational context, which allowed for an in-depth examination of the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition within a bounded group. However, this limited sample size may restrict the generalizability of the findings to broader populations, and therefore, the results should be interpreted with caution. Prior to data collection, authorization was obtained from the school administration, and informed consent was secured from both parents and students. Ethical principles were strictly observed by safeguarding participants' anonymity, ensuring voluntary participation, and administering the instruments under standardized conditions.

Two testing instruments were used to collect quantitative data. The first instrument assessed listening skills and was adapted from the English Practice Test, aligned with CEFR A2 descriptors. It consisted of 20 items distributed across four subskills: understanding the speaker's purpose (5 items), making inferences (5 items), recognizing connected speech (5 items), and identifying specific information (5 items). The test included short audio texts such as monologues, conversations, and announcements, followed by multiple-choice questions.

For example, students were required to identify the main intention of a speaker, infer meaning from context, recognize reduced or linked forms in spoken language, or select specific details explicitly stated in the audio.

The second instrument measured vocabulary acquisition and was also adapted from the same platform. It comprised 20 items that evaluated three components of vocabulary knowledge: meaning (7 items), use (7 items), and form (6 items), in line with the multidimensional model of vocabulary competence. The test included multiple-choice and matching question types, where learners identified word meanings in context, selected appropriate lexical items to complete sentences, and recognized correct word forms. Both instruments were reviewed by experts to ensure content validity and age appropriateness for A2 learners, and they were administered under standardized conditions to enhance the reliability of the results. The research procedure began with the acquisition of institutional permission and parental consent. The listening test was administered first, followed by the vocabulary test within the same week during regular English lessons to preserve the natural classroom environment. To minimize potential administration biases, both instruments were applied under standardized conditions. Clear and uniform instructions were provided in both English and Spanish using a previously prepared script to ensure consistency across participants. Additionally, all students were given the same amount of time to complete each test, and the administration took place in a quiet classroom setting where external distractions were minimized. The researcher also monitored the process to ensure that no additional explanations or variations in instruction were introduced during the sessions. After administration, all responses were coded and entered into a database for statistical analysis using Jamovi. Data analysis involved both descriptive and inferential techniques. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation, and score ranges were used to summarize students' performance.

To determine the appropriate correlation test, the Shapiro–Wilk normality test was performed. Results showed that listening scores were normally distributed ($p = .164$), whereas vocabulary scores violated the normality assumption ($p = .041$). Given that at least one variable was non-normal, the Spearman’s rho coefficient was selected as the most suitable procedure to examine the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition, as recommended by Bhandari (2021). The hypothesis tested was whether a significant relationship existed between the two variables. The interpretation of the correlation strength followed Siedlecki (2020) guidelines. Additionally, scatterplots were generated to visually support the statistical findings and facilitate interpretation of the correlation trend.

The strength of the correlation was interpreted according to Siedlecki (2020), as presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Interpretation of Correlation Coefficient Strength

Correlation Coefficient (r)	Strength of Relationship
0.00–0.10	Negligible
0.10–0.39	Weak
0.40–0.69	Moderate
0.70–0.89	Strong
0.90–1.00	Very Strong

Note. Adapted from “A user’s guide to correlation coefficients,” by H. Akoglu, 2018, Turkish Journal of Emergency Medicine, 18(3), 91–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tjem.2018.08.001>

The research process started with the delimitation of the study’s scope, followed by the selection of participants and the design of assessment instruments adjusted to the students’ English proficiency level. Prior to implementation, both instruments were reviewed by a group of specialists to verify content validity and ensure their suitability for the target population. Based on their feedback, minor refinements were made. Subsequently, formal

authorization was obtained from the relevant educational authorities and the participating institution. After receiving approval, students were informed about the objectives of the study, and ethical procedures were observed by securing parental consent and student assent, as well as guaranteeing confidentiality and anonymity. The instruments were administered in controlled classroom conditions, and the collected data were carefully coded and analyzed using Jamovi software. These analyses served as the basis for the interpretation of results, discussion, and final conclusions.

RESULTS

Objective 1 (Descriptive Analysis). To identify the strengths and weaknesses in listening comprehension among 10th-grade EFL students.

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of listening comprehension subskills

	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Understanding speaker's purpose (2,5 points)	20	1.93	0.494	1.000	2.50
Making inferences from context (2,5 points)	20	1.40	0.447	0.500	2.00
Understanding connected speech (2,5 points)	20	1.48	0.617	0.500	2.50
Recognizing specific information (2,5 points)	20	2.06	0.352	1.500	2.50
TOTAL (10 points)	20	6.86	1.154	5.000	9.00

Table 1 shows that students demonstrated an overall moderate level of listening comprehension, with total scores ranging from 5.00 to 9.00 points. The highest mean score corresponded to “recognizing specific information” ($M = 2.06$), indicating that learners performed better when the listening task provided explicit and easily detectable details. This trend aligns with observations in L2 listening literature suggesting that lower-intermediate learners tend to rely on surface-level cues for comprehension.

In contrast, “making inferences” obtained the lowest mean score ($M = 1.40$). This suggests that students struggled to interpret implicit meaning or understand information not directly stated in the audio input. The standard deviation (0.447) also reveals moderate differences among students, which indicates that while a few demonstrated inference skills, most experienced considerable difficulty. Similar challenges with inferential comprehension have been documented among A2-level listeners, who often need stronger lexical and contextual knowledge to interpret implied meaning.

Regarding “understanding connected speech,” the mean score (1.48) and the highest standard deviation (0.617) reveal that students showed varied ability in identifying reduced forms, linking, and faster speech. This is typically considered one of the most problematic aspects of listening for EFL learners.

Finally, “understanding the speaker’s purpose” received a relatively higher mean (1.93), showing that students were moderately able to identify the general intention behind the message. Overall, although learners managed literal comprehension tasks, they displayed weaknesses in deeper processing skills such as inferencing and decoding connected speech.

Objective 2 (Descriptive statistics). To measure the extent of vocabulary knowledge (breadth and depth) among 10th-grade EFL learners.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of students' vocabulary acquisition (breadth and depth)

	N	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Form Aspect (3 points)	20	2.38	0.646	1.00	3.00
Meaning aspect (3 points)	20	2.25	0.698	1.00	3.00
Use aspect (4 points)	20	3.42	0.936	2.00	5.00
TOTAL (10 points)	20	8.05	1.337	5.50	10.00

The scores in Table 2 indicate that students achieved a generally strong performance in vocabulary, with a total mean of 8.05 points. Among the three dimensions, “use” obtained the highest mean (3.42), showing that learners were more capable of applying vocabulary in context. The wide range (2.00 to 5.00 points) demonstrates some variability, suggesting that while many students used lexical items effectively, others still required support to use vocabulary appropriately in sentences.

The “meaning” dimension obtained the lowest mean (2.25), reflecting that some learners lacked sufficient semantic depth to distinguish related meanings or identify nuanced associations. This pattern is common among learners with limited exposure to contextualized vocabulary use. “Form” presented a relatively strong mean (2.38), indicating that students generally recognized word spelling and structure, though some still showed minor difficulties.

Altogether, the results suggest that while students possess an acceptable vocabulary foundation, gaps in semantic understanding may hinder performance in tasks requiring deeper interpretation, such as inferential listening.

Objective 3 (Inferential Analysis). To determine the relationship between students' listening skills and vocabulary knowledge.

Table 3 Results of the Shapiro–Wilk normality test for listening and vocabulary scores

	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Shapiro-Wilk	
					W	p
Listening Test	20	6.86	5.00	9.00	0.949	>0.347
Vocabulary Test	20	8.05	5.50	10.00	0.931	>0.164

Note. $p > .05$ indicates that the data follow a normal distribution.

The results of the Shapiro–Wilk normality test indicate that both variables—listening skills ($W = 0.949$, $p = 0.347$) and vocabulary knowledge ($W = 0.931$, $p = 0.164$)—present p-values greater than the significance level of 0.05. This suggests that there is no statistically significant deviation from a normal distribution for either variable. Therefore, the assumption of normality is met, supporting the use of parametric statistical procedures. Based on this result, the Pearson correlation coefficient was deemed appropriate to examine the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary knowledge.

Table 4 Pearson correlation matrix between listening skills and vocabulary knowledge

Variable	1	2
1. Listening Test	—	
2. Vocabulary Test	0.612**	—

***Note.** $*p < .01$ (2-tailed).

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis reveal a statistically significant positive relationship between listening skills and vocabulary knowledge ($r = 0.612$, $p < .01$). This indicates a moderate to strong correlation, suggesting that students with higher listening comprehension scores tend to demonstrate greater vocabulary knowledge.

From a practical educational perspective, this finding implies that listening activities play a meaningful role in supporting vocabulary development in EFL classrooms. Specifically, increased exposure to spoken input—such as dialogues, audio recordings, and authentic listening materials can help learners acquire new vocabulary in context, improve word recognition, and develop a better understanding of usage and pronunciation. Therefore, incorporating systematic listening practice into English instruction may contribute to strengthening students' vocabulary acquisition and overall communicative competence.

DISCUSSION

The present study examined the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition among tenth-grade English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners enrolled in a private fiscomisional institution in Loja during the 2025–2026 school year. Using a quantitative correlational design, the research addressed three guiding questions aligned with the specific objectives of the study, contributing to the growing body of research on the interdependence of receptive skills and lexical knowledge in EFL contexts.

The first question focused on identifying the strengths and weaknesses in listening comprehension. The descriptive findings indicated that students performed better in recognizing explicit information than in tasks requiring inferential reasoning or interpretation of implicit meaning. This result confirms previous findings by Mclean and Rouault (2017), which highlight that learners at lower proficiency levels rely primarily on literal comprehension strategies. Furthermore, the present study extends this line of research by providing empirical evidence from an Ecuadorian EFL context, where similar patterns of listening development are observed. This suggests that the progression from literal to inferential comprehension may be a consistent feature across different educational settings, reinforcing the notion of a developmental trajectory in listening skills acquisition.

The second question examined the extent of vocabulary knowledge in terms of meaning,

use, and form. The results showed that students achieved their highest performance in the “use” component and their lowest in “meaning.” This finding is consistent with González (2022), who argues that learners tend to acquire functional aspects of vocabulary before developing deeper semantic knowledge. In addition, the results align with Laufer and Ravenhorst (2010), who emphasize that semantic depth requires sustained exposure and cognitive processing. Importantly, this study extends previous research by evidencing that this imbalance between use and meaning is also present in secondary-level EFL learners in Ecuador, highlighting a potential gap in vocabulary instruction. Therefore, the findings suggest the need for pedagogical approaches that promote deeper semantic processing rather than solely focusing on functional usage.

The third question explored whether there was a significant relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition. The correlational analysis revealed a positive and statistically significant association between the two variables, indicating that stronger vocabulary knowledge is linked to better listening performance. This result confirms prior studies by Zhang and Graham (2020), Pizarro and Aulestia (2025), and Khajavy, G. H., & Aghaee, E. (2023), which emphasize the role of vocabulary breadth, depth, and phonological knowledge in facilitating listening comprehension processes such as speech segmentation and lexical access. Moreover, the present findings extend existing literature by demonstrating this relationship within a specific Latin American EFL context, thereby contributing to the external validity of these theoretical claims. At the same time, the moderate-to-strong correlation observed suggests that vocabulary is a key, though not exclusive, factor influencing listening performance, indicating the need to consider additional linguistic and cognitive variables.

Although the findings demonstrate a significant relationship, several alternative explanations may help contextualize the results.

Learners may have been exposed to English through digital media, extracurricular activities, or informal learning environments that were not controlled in the study. Additionally, affective factors such as motivation, anxiety, and confidence may have influenced students' performance, as suggested in prior listening research. These factors indicate that the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary knowledge is complex and multifaceted, and cannot be explained by a single variable.

Despite its contributions, this study presents important limitations that must be acknowledged. First, the small sample size ($N = 20$) limits the generalizability of the findings, as the results may not be representative of broader EFL populations. Second, the correlational design does not allow for causal inferences; therefore, it cannot be concluded that vocabulary knowledge directly causes improvements in listening skills. These limitations highlight the need for caution when interpreting the results.

Future research should address these constraints by employing larger and more diverse samples to enhance generalizability. In addition, experimental or longitudinal designs are recommended to examine causal relationships and track the development of listening and vocabulary skills over time. Such approaches would provide a more robust understanding of how these variables interact and inform more effective pedagogical interventions in EFL contexts.

In conclusion, this study contributes to the existing literature by confirming and extending previous findings on the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition, particularly within an under-researched Ecuadorian educational context. The results underscore the importance of integrating vocabulary development and listening practice in EFL instruction, while also pointing to the need for more comprehensive and methodologically robust future investigations.

CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition among tenth-grade EFL learners and found a statistically significant positive correlation between the two variables. The results confirm that students with stronger vocabulary knowledge tend to demonstrate higher levels of listening comprehension.

Regarding to listening subskills, learners showed greater success in identifying explicit information, while inferential comprehension and processing connected speech posed greater challenges. These findings highlight the need for instructional practices that support deeper listening processes rather than focusing solely on surface-level comprehension.

In terms of vocabulary acquisition, students demonstrated stronger performance in functional usage and weaker performance in semantic depth. This imbalance suggests that vocabulary instruction should place greater emphasis on meaning development and contextualized lexical relationships to support higher-order comprehension.

The study identified a significant positive relationship between listening skills and vocabulary acquisition. Learners demonstrated greater difficulty with inferential listening and semantic knowledge, highlighting the need for integrated instructional approaches. These findings contribute evidence from an underrepresented educational context and support pedagogical practices that combine listening and vocabulary development.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, 3(3), 21-34.
<https://doi.org/10.20472/TE.2015.3.3.002>
- Bhandari, P. (2021). *Correlational research: When & how to use it*. Scribbr.
<https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/correlational-research/>

- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2024). *Research methods in education* (9th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003310044>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications. <https://www.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/research-design/book276230>
- El-Dakhs, D. A. S. (2022). The lexical dimension of second language listening: A focus on vocabulary knowledge. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 51, 1055–1075. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-022-09879-6>
- González-Fernández, B. (2022). Vocabulary knowledge: Lexical depth and its relationship with out-of-class exposure. In *Vocabulary Theory, Patterning and Teaching* (pp. 19-45). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788923750-005>
- Khajavy, G. H., & Aghaee, E. (2023). Revisiting the relationship between vocabulary knowledge and listening comprehension: A multivariate analysis. *System*, 115, 103058. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2023.103058>
- Laufer, B., & Ravenhorst-Kalovski, G. C. (2010). Lexical threshold revisited: Lexical coverage, learners' vocabulary size and reading comprehension. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 22(1), 15-30. <https://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2010/articles/laufer.pdf>
- McClean, S., & Rouault, G. (2017). The effectiveness of vocabulary learning via mobile devices. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 29(1), 89-111. <https://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/April2017/articles/mcclean.pdf>
- Milton, J., & Roche, T. (2020). Vocabulary Size and Skills in a Second Language. *Multilingual Matters*. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781788928649>
- Pizarro, G., & Aulestia, J. (2025). *Lexical development as a key component in strengthening oral comprehension in rural EFL contexts*. *Ciencia Latina Revista Científica Multidisciplinar*. https://doi.org/10.37811/cl_rcm.v9i1.13500

- Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2020). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108348218>
- Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 34(1), 8-12. <https://doi.org/10.1097/NUR.0000000000000493>
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. C. (2012). *Teaching and Learning Second Language Listening: Metacognition, Process, and Strategy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203843376>
- Wallace, M. P. (2022). Individual differences in second language listening: Examining the role of vocabulary knowledge and metacognitive awareness. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.955430>
- Wallace, M. P., & Lee, K. (2020). Examining second language listening, vocabulary, and executive functioning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1122. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01122>
- Zhang, X., & Yuan, Y. (2021). The effects of explicit training in connected speech on EFL learners' listening comprehension. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 54, 101043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101043>
- Zhang, X., & Graham, S. (2020). The relationship between vocabulary knowledge and L2 listening comprehension: A meta-analysis. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 11(4), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2019-0123>

La Revista utiliza códigos para identificar al Editor y al equipo de
PARES REVISORES. Si tiene dudas o consultas, contacte a:
contacto@cienciayreflexion.org
Código de Editor: 104
Código de Revisores: 861

