JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES
PRINT ISSN: 2984-8288 | ONLINE ISSN: 2984-8385
https://doi.org/10.69569/jip

TWR Publishing

Research Article

English-Speaking Skills and Instructional Preparedness of Pre-Service Teachers

Jan Emman S. Brigoli, Mith Maricar O. Malacaste, Kasandra Claire B. Naingue, Jeafil G. Pakingan, Angelie Kate T. Pentucan, Angen May F. Charcos

Author Information:

College of Education, Cebu Technological University- Tuburan Campus, Tuburan, Cebu, Philippines

Corresponding Author:

Jan Emman S. Brigoli
Email: emmanuelbrigoli6@gmail.com

Article History:

Date received: October 1, 2026
Date revised: November 10, 2026
Date accepted: November 20, 2026

Recommended citation:

Brigoli, J.E., Malacaste, M.M., Naingue, K. C., Pakingan, J., Pentucan, A.K., & Charcos, A.M. (2026). English-speaking skills and instructional preparedness of pre-service teachers. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *4*(12), 326-338. https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2026.503

Abstract. This study examined the relationship between self-reported English-speaking skills and perceived instructional preparedness among fourth-year pre-service teachers. Although previous studies have discussed speaking difficulties and teacher readiness, localized evidence connecting particular speaking dimensions with specific instructional-preparedness dimensions remains limited. A descriptive-correlational mixed-methods design was employed with 145 participants selected through universal sampling. Data were gathered using a modified questionnaire and open-ended questions. Descriptive statistics and Pearson's product–moment correlation were used for the quantitative data, while responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed thematically. Respondents reported regular exposure to English, particularly through radio and television programs, and generally good perceived preparedness across the seven instructional dimensions. Significant but small positive associations were observed between pronunciation and building background (r = .19, p = .024), comprehensible input (r = .26, p = .002), and strategies (r = .24, p = .003). Diction was associated with comprehensible input (r = .24, p = .005) and strategies (r = .17, p = .048). Other significant associations involved vocabulary, confidence, and grammar with selected preparedness dimensions. Qualitative responses highlighted media exposure, interactive communication, and emotional resilience, while also describing anxiety and fear of negative evaluation. Taken together, the findings suggest that language-related self-perceptions and perceived instructional preparedness are connected in selected areas but should not be treated as interchangeable competencies. Teacher education programs may consider combining authentic speaking opportunities, guided instructional practice, and constructive feedback. Considering the study relied on self-reports and a single-campus correlational design, the findings should be interpreted as associations rather than causal effects.

Keywords: *English-speaking skills; Instructional preparedness; Pre-service teachers; Speaking confidence; Teacher education.*

English-speaking competence is an important part of pre-service teacher preparation. Teachers rely on oral communication to explain concepts, facilitate classroom interaction, respond to learners, and give feedback. Difficulties in pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, diction, fluency, and confidence may therefore affect how clearly future teachers communicate during instructional activities. Kenoh (2021) described speaking anxiety among pre-service teachers, while Istiqomah (2024) examined the relationship between speaking anxiety and learners' speaking performance. These concerns point to the need to consider both language-related skills and the conditions in which future teachers are expected to use them.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Studies in the Philippine setting also identify challenges in developing oral communication. Orge et al. (2024) discussed vocabulary limitations, self-talk, and exposure among education students. Santos et al. (2022) highlighted the importance of addressing grammatical accuracy and articulation in English language development. Torreces and Brillantes (2022) examined English language acquisition, attitude, and speaking proficiency among pre-service teachers in a Philippine state university. Together, these studies suggest that speaking competence involves more than familiarity with language rules; it also requires opportunities to use English in purposeful, interactive situations. These concerns also extend to instructional readiness. Pre-service teachers are expected to communicate content clearly, connect lessons with learners' prior knowledge, select appropriate strategies, encourage interaction, and guide practice. Panganoron-Jabonete (2022) discussed instructional strategies used by pre-service English teachers, while Sebastian and Villa (2025) examined teaching preparedness in relation to teaching competencies. These studies offer useful perspectives on teacher readiness, but they do not fully address how specific self-reported speaking dimensions align with specific instructional-preparedness dimensions within the same group of pre-service teachers.

The study is informed by Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), Krashen's Second Language Acquisition Theory, and Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory. CLT provides the broad communicative orientation: language is used to convey meaning and participate in purposeful interaction. Hymes (1972) established communicative competence as a broader concept than grammatical knowledge alone. In this study, pronunciation, vocabulary, confidence, grammar, and diction are treated as self-reported speaking-related dimensions that may be relevant to classroom communication, rather than as direct measures of overall communicative competence. Krashen's Second Language Acquisition Theory offers a complementary perspective on language exposure and affective conditions. Krashen (1982) emphasized the role of comprehensible input in language acquisition and discussed how affective variables may influence learners' engagement with language. This perspective is relevant to the study's exposure and confidence dimensions, as well as to the preparedness dimension labeled comprehensive input. However, the questionnaire score for comprehensive input represents respondents' perceived instructional practice; it is not a direct measurement of language input or acquisition. Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory highlights the role of social interaction, guidance, and scaffolding in learning. Vygotsky (1978) explained how development is supported through interaction with others and assistance within the learner's Zone of Proximal Development. This perspective informs the interpretation of the study's dimensions of building background, interaction, practice and application, and lesson delivery. The three perspectives serve complementary purposes: CLT foregrounds meaningful communication, Krashen provides a language-learning perspective on input and affect, and Vygotsky explains the social and guided nature of learning. They help frame the study but do not establish that a particular speaking dimension causes a particular preparedness outcome.

Although previous research has addressed speaking difficulties, language proficiency, speaking anxiety, instructional strategies, and teacher preparedness, localized evidence remains limited on the associations between specific English-speaking dimensions and specific instructional-preparedness dimensions within one teacher-education setting. In particular, it remains useful to examine whether pronunciation, vocabulary, confidence, grammar, and diction are associated with lesson preparedness, building background, comprehensive input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, and lesson delivery. Addressing this gap can clarify which dimensions are related in the present context without assuming that all aspects of language competence and instructional readiness develop together. Accordingly, this study examined the relationship between self-reported English-speaking skills and perceived instructional preparedness among fourth-year pre-service teachers at Cebu Technological University–Tuburan Campus during Academic Year 2025–2026. Specifically, it described respondents' exposure to English-speaking practices and their perceived pronunciation, vocabulary, confidence, grammar, and diction; assessed their perceived preparedness across seven instructional dimensions; tested relationships between the speaking-related and preparedness dimensions; and explored their experiences acquiring English-speaking skills. The study provides localized evidence on how linguistic self-perceptions and perceived instructional preparedness intersect among pre-service teachers. Its findings may inform teacher-education activities that integrate authentic speaking opportunities, meaningful input, guided interaction, and supportive feedback. These implications are presented as considerations for practice rather than claims that any single activity will improve proficiency or teaching performance.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-correlational mixed-methods design. The quantitative component described respondents' exposure to English-speaking practices, self-reported speaking-related skills, and perceived instructional preparedness, and examined the relationships between the measured dimensions. The qualitative component explored respondents' experiences in acquiring English-speaking skills through open-ended questions. The two strands were integrated during interpretation: the quantitative results identified patterns of association, while the qualitative responses provided context on exposure, interaction, confidence, and speaking-related challenges. The design was appropriate because the study sought to describe existing conditions and examine associations, not to manipulate variables or establish causal effects.

Participants and Sampling Technique

The participants were 145 fourth-year pre-service teachers enrolled at Cebu Technological University–Tuburan Campus during Academic Year 2025–2026. Universal sampling was used to include the identified fourth-year pre-service teacher group across the degree programs: (18) BSEd-English, (34) BSEd-Math, (30) BTLEd-Home Economics, (31) BEEd-Day, and (32) BEEd-Evening of the College of Education represented in the study. Participation was voluntary and required informed consent. To ensure the integrity of the data, the inclusion criteria required that respondents be officially enrolled pre-service teachers within the specified programs and currently active in their internship phase, while the exclusion criteria disqualified students from other colleges, those on an official leave of absence, or those who did not provide voluntary consent to participate.

Research Instruments

The study utilized a modified and adapted questionnaire consisting of five components: (1) demographic information, particularly age and gender; (2) exposure to English-speaking practices; (3) five self-reported English-speaking dimensions, namely pronunciation, vocabulary, confidence, grammar, and diction; (4) seven perceived instructional-preparedness dimensions, namely lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, instructional strategies, interaction, practice and application, and lesson delivery; and (5) open-ended questions intended to gather further insights into the respondents' experiences and challenges in developing their English-speaking skills. The demographic items were adapted from Meniado (2019), while the items on exposure to English-speaking practices and the five speaking-related dimensions were adapted and modified from Nzamurabaho and Ali (2024). The instructional-preparedness items were adapted and modified from Echevarría et al. (2017) and drew on the seven components of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) framework. The closed-ended items used a four-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (lowest rating) to 4 (highest rating), while the open-ended questions allowed respondents to explain their experiences in their own words. To establish content validity, the instrument was reviewed by the research panel, grammarian, panel co-chairperson, and chairperson, who assessed the clarity, relevance, grammatical accuracy, and alignment of the items with the research objectives. Their comments and recommendations were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaire. The revised instrument was pilot-tested with 30 respondents who were excluded from the main study. Its internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a coefficient of .883 for the English-speaking skills scale and .865 for the instructional-preparedness scale, as confirmed by the study statistician. These coefficients indicated acceptable internal consistency for both scales.

Data Gathering Procedure

Before the actual data collection, the researchers secured permission from the appropriate university authorities and department chairpersons through formal transmittal letters to conduct the study at Cebu Technological University–Tuburan Campus. The questionnaire underwent expert review and pilot testing to assess the clarity, relevance, and alignment of its items with the research objectives, while its internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. The main data collection was conducted from September 22 to 26, 2025, during which the researchers administered the questionnaires to the respondents and conducted interviews with the selected participants. Before participation, the researchers explained the study's purpose and procedures and obtained informed consent from all participants. They were assured that participation was voluntary, their responses would remain confidential, and they could decline or withdraw without penalty. After administration, the completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked, and organized for quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

The quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe the respondents' demographic profiles in terms of age and gender, while weighted means and standard deviations were computed to determine their levels of exposure to English-speaking practices, speaking-related skills in pronunciation, vocabulary, confidence, grammar, and diction, and instructional preparedness across seven dimensions: lesson preparedness, building background, comprehensible input, instructional strategies, interaction, practice and application, and lesson delivery. The responses were interpreted using the four-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating greater engagement in English-speaking practices, stronger agreement with statements describing speaking-related experiences, and a higher perceived level of instructional preparedness. Pearson's product–moment correlation coefficient (r) was employed to examine the strength and direction of the linear associations between the five speaking-related dimensions and the seven instructional-preparedness dimensions, involving 35 pairwise tests at a two-tailed significance level of $\alpha = .05$. The assumptions of independence of observations, linearity, approximate normality, and absence of influential outliers were considered in determining the appropriateness of the correlation analysis; however, only diagnostics actually conducted were reported. Because no adjustment for multiple comparisons was applied, statistically significant findings were interpreted cautiously as exploratory associations, not as evidence of causation.

Meanwhile, qualitative responses from the open-ended questionnaire items and interviews were analyzed thematically through familiarization with the data, identifying relevant statements, initial coding, grouping similar codes into categories and subthemes, and synthesizing overarching themes. To support the trustworthiness of the analysis, the researchers maintained consistency in organizing and interpreting responses and ensured the identified themes were grounded in participants' actual statements. Finally, the researchers integrated the qualitative findings with the quantitative results during interpretation and discussion to provide contextual explanations of the statistical patterns and a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between English-speaking skills and instructional preparedness.

Ethical Considerations

The researchers sought voluntary participation and informed consent from all respondents. Participants were informed of the study's academic purpose and their right to decline or withdraw without penalty. Responses were treated confidentially, and the presentation of findings did not include identifying information. Data handling followed the stated commitment to Republic Act No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

Results and Discussion

Profile of the Respondents

In terms of Age and Gender

Table 1. *Distribution of Respondents by Age and Gender*

Indicators	%	Cumulative %
Age		
20–22	84.80	84.80
23–25	12.40	97.20
26–28	1.40	98.60
29 and above	1.40	100.00
Gender		
Male	9.70	9.70
Female	90.30	100.00

Note. Data analysis results of the research.

The respondents were predominantly 20–22 years old (84.80%), and 90.30% were female. These figures describe the composition of the 145-person sample and should not be interpreted as evidence that age or gender produced differences in English-speaking skills or instructional preparedness. The concentration in the 20–22 age group is

consistent with the participants' status as fourth-year pre-service teachers. The gender distribution should likewise be understood as a characteristic of this particular sample. The age and gender profile provides context for interpreting the responses but does not explain individual differences in speaking-related skills. Because the study did not test age or gender as predictors of the measured outcomes, claims about their influence would go beyond the analysis. The discussion therefore treats these characteristics descriptively and focuses on the speaking-related and preparedness dimensions addressed by the research questions.

In terms of Exposure to English-Speaking Practices

Table 2. *Exposure to English-Speaking Practices*

Statements	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
1. I have a lot of opportunities to speak English with other students at school	2.90	0.56	Engaged
2. I have a lot of opportunities to speak English at home.	2.68	0.71	Engaged
3. I use English to get services in my daily life.	2.50	0.69	Unengaged
4. I use textbooks to practice individual English-speaking skills	2.93	0.69	Engaged
5. I listen to radio or TV news/show in English to practice my English-speaking skills	3.14	0.67	Engaged
Column Mean	**2.83**	**0.44**	**Engaged**

Note. M=Mean, *SD*=Standard deviation. Results were interpreted as follows: 3.26- 4.00 = Strongly Engaged; 2.51-3.25=Engaged; 1.76-2.50=Unengaged; 1.00-1.75=Strongly Unengaged.

Respondents reported regular engagement with English-speaking practices overall (M = 2.83, SD = 0.44). Listening to radio or television programs in English received the highest mean (M = 3.14, SD = 0.67), whereas using English to obtain services in daily life received the lowest mean (M = 2.50, SD = 0.69). Under the scale presented below in Table 2, the highest item falls within "Engaged," while the lowest falls at the upper boundary of "Unengaged." The pattern suggests that respondents encountered English through media more often than through everyday service interactions. The difference between media exposure and direct everyday use is important when considering opportunities to practice spontaneous communication. Radio and television can provide repeated exposure to spoken English, but listening alone does not necessarily require learners to formulate and deliver their own messages. De Leon and Olegario (2024) discussed collaborative speech activities as a way to support speaking and confidence. Rahman et al. (2018) examined the relationship between teacher beliefs and classroom practices in communicative language teaching. In the present study, the relatively lower score for everyday use points to a possible need for more opportunities to use English in authentic, low-pressure interactions; however, the descriptive data do not establish that limited daily use caused any particular speaking difficulty.

Self-Reported English-Speaking Skills

Across the five self-reported speaking-related dimensions, respondents reported engagement in practices associated with pronunciation (M = 3.15, SD = 0.43), vocabulary (M = 3.12, SD = 0.43), diction (M = 3.09, SD = 0.48), confidence (M = 2.77, SD = 0.54), and grammar (M = 2.75, SD = 0.47). Pronunciation had the highest dimension mean, while grammar had the lowest, closely followed by confidence. The item-level results indicate that respondents often checked the pronunciation of unfamiliar words and sought clarification from teachers. Reading English texts was the highest-rated vocabulary practice, while confidence was comparatively lower when respondents had to speak without preparation. These are self-reported practices and perceptions, not direct assessments of oral proficiency.

The results suggest a distinction between deliberate preparation and spontaneous language use. Checking pronunciation, reading, and reviewing vocabulary can help learners prepare for communication, but these activities do not fully represent the demands of real-time speaking. Adinda and Ahmad (2024) discussed the role of pronunciation instruction in English learning. Fatihatus and Havid (2020) examined pronunciation errors involving English diphthongs, illustrating the specific sound-related challenges that learners may encounter. In the present study, the comparatively lower means for confidence and grammar indicate areas that respondents may wish to strengthen through supported opportunities to formulate ideas and communicate without relying entirely on prepared language.

Table 3. *Respondents' Self-Reported English-Speaking Skills*

Statements	*M*	*SD*	Interpretation
Pronunciation			
1. I like studying phonetics to improve my pronunciation.	2.98	0.61	Engaged
2. I know how to check the pronunciation of a word in a dictionary.	3.08	0.65	Engaged
3. I check the pronunciation of a new word to be able to pronounce.	3.27	0.58	Strongly Engaged
4. The teacher clarifies the pronunciation of important words during the lesson to help students improve their pronunciation.	3.28	0.62	Strongly Engaged
Column Mean	3.15	0.43	Engaged
Vocabulary			
1. I improve my English vocabulary using an English-Filipino dictionary.	3.06	0.62	Engaged
2. I practice every new vocabulary word in English conversation.	3.06	0.55	Engaged
3. I read stories /text in English to improve my vocabulary for English-speaking skills.	3.22	0.61	Engaged
4. I play word games to improve my vocabulary for English-speaking.	3.13	0.63	Engaged
Column Mean	3.12	0.43	Engaged
Confidence			
1. I am confident in speaking out because I am sure of what I am going to say.	2.60	0.72	Engaged
2. I am confident in speaking English because other students won't laugh at me.	2.63	0.71	Engaged
3. I am confident in speaking because I think my English has improved now.	2.74	0.67	Engaged
4. I am confident in speaking when I understand the topic.	3.10	0.60	Engaged
Column Mean	2.77	0.54	Engaged
Grammar			
1. I speak using grammatically correct sentences.	2.77	0.62	Engaged
2. I can use correct verb tenses while speaking.	2.75	0.64	Engaged
3. I avoid common grammar mistakes when I talk in English.	2.72	0.64	Engaged
4. I can apply grammar rules correctly during conversations.	2.76	0.58	Engaged
Column Mean	2.75	0.47	Engaged
Diction			
1. I choose words that clearly express my ideas.	3.20	0.58	Engaged
2. I use appropriate and accurate vocabulary when I speak.	3.07	0.62	Engaged
3. I pronounce words clearly and correctly in English.	2.97	0.66	Engaged
4. I adjust my word choice depending on whom I am talking to.	3.14	0.60	Engaged
Column Mean	3.09	0.48	Engaged

Note. M=Mean, *SD*=Standard deviation. Results were interpreted as follows: 3.26- 4.00 = Strongly Engaged; 2.51-3.25=Engaged; 1.76-2.50=Unengaged; 1.00-1.75=Strongly Unengaged.

Perceived Instructional Preparedness

Respondents generally rated their instructional preparedness as "Good" across the seven dimensions. The highest dimension mean was for interaction (M = 3.25, SD = 0.47), followed by comprehensible input (M = 3.24, SD = 0.48), strategies (M = 3.14, SD = 0.45), building background (M = 3.13, SD = 0.40), practice and application (M = 3.10, SD = 0.48), lesson delivery (M = 3.07, SD = 0.47), and lesson preparedness (M = 3.00, SD = 0.36). The overall pattern indicates positive self-perceptions across the assessed areas, with lesson preparedness receiving the lowest dimension mean. Within interaction, creating a respectful classroom environment received the highest item mean (M = 3.32), while managing time during lesson delivery received a comparatively lower mean (M = 2.97). These results describe perceived readiness rather than observed teaching performance. The relatively high rating for interaction suggests that respondents felt prepared to encourage participation and maintain respectful classroom communication. The lower mean for lesson preparedness points to an area for further practice, particularly in writing measurable objectives and organizing lesson components. Halamury and Sahertian (2021) discussed systematic lesson preparation in the context of teacher practice. Alaon et al. (2023) examined self-directed strategies for improving English communication skills. These studies provide related perspectives, although their contexts differ from the present study. The findings support continued opportunities for lesson planning, rehearsal, feedback, and reflective teaching practice.

Table 4. *Respondents' Perceived Instructional Preparedness*

Statements	*M*	*SD*	*Interpretation*
Lesson Preparedness			
1. I can develop comprehensive lesson plans aligned with curriculum standards.	3.00	.44	Good
2. I can design lesson objectives that are clear and measurable.	2.92	.52	Good
3. I can select and organize content that meets students' learning needs.	3.10	.45	Good
Column Mean	3.00	.36	Good
Building Background			
1. I can assess students' prior knowledge before introducing new content.	3.08	.50	Good
2. I can connect new lessons to students' real- life experiences.	3.19	.51	Good
3. I can utilize students' cultural backgrounds to make lessons more relatable.	3.12	.49	Good
Column Mean	3.13	.40	Good
Comprehensible Input			
1. I can adjust my language to ensure students understand the lesson.	3.23	.60	Good
2. I can use visual aids and gestures to enhance comprehension.	3.26	.57	Excellent
3. I can check for understanding and clarify misunderstandings promptly.	3.22	.50	Good
Column Mean	3.24	.48	Good
Strategies			
1. I can implement a variety of teaching strategies to cater to diverse learners.	3.15	.60	Good
2. I can modify instructional strategies based on student feedback.	3.17	.55	Good
3. I can integrate technology effectively into my teaching strategies.	3.10	.56	Good
Column Mean	3.14	.45	Good
Interaction			
1. I can facilitate meaningful classroom discussions among students.	3.17	.55	Good
2. I can encourage students to ask questions and express their ideas.	3.26	.56	Excellent
3. I can create a classroom environment that promotes respectful interactions.	3.32	.57	Excellent
Column Mean	3.25	.47	Good
Practice and Application			
1. I can design activities that allow students to apply new knowledge in a practical way.	3.11	.54	Good
2. I can provide opportunities for students to practice skills in collaborative settings.	3.08	.65	Good
3. I can assess and give feedback on students' application of skills and knowledge.	3.11	.57	Good
Column Mean	3.10	.48	Good
Lesson Delivery			
1. I can present lessons in a clear and organized manner.	3.13	.59	Good
2. I can manage classroom time effectively to cover all lesson components	2.97	.51	Good
3. I can engage students throughout the lesson to maintain their attention and interest.	3.08	.57	Good
Column Mean	3.07	.471	Good

Note. M=Mean, *SD*=Standard deviation. Results were interpreted as follows: 3.26-4.00=Excellent; 2.51-3.25=Good; 1.76-2.50=Poor; 1.00-1.75=Not Observed.

Relationships Between English-Speaking Skills and Instructional Preparedness

Table 5 presents the Pearson correlation results examining the relationships between the five English-speaking dimensions—pronunciation, vocabulary, confidence, grammar, and diction—and the seven dimensions of instructional preparedness. The analysis involved 35 pairwise correlations. The results revealed several statistically significant relationships, although the correlation coefficients were generally small, suggesting weak associations between the variables. These findings indicate that certain speaking-related dimensions are associated with particular aspects of instructional preparedness; however, the relationships should be interpreted cautiously, especially considering the number of comparisons conducted and the absence of a reported adjustment for multiple testing. Moreover, statistical significance does not necessarily indicate substantial practical importance.

In terms of Pronunciation. The findings revealed statistically significant positive relationships between pronunciation and three dimensions of instructional preparedness: building background ($r = .187$, $p = .024$), comprehensible input ($r = .261$, $p = .002$), and instructional strategies ($r = .242$, $p = .003$). These results indicate that higher self-reported pronunciation ratings were associated with higher perceived preparedness in these areas. However, the correlation coefficients suggest weak relationships, with comprehensible input demonstrating the strongest association among the three. In contrast, lesson preparedness ($r = .038$, $p = .649$), interaction ($r = .142$, p

= .088), practice and application (r = .081, p = .336), and lesson delivery (r = −.062, p = .462) did not show statistically significant relationships with pronunciation. These nonsignificant findings suggest that respondents' pronunciation ratings were not sufficiently associated with these particular dimensions of instructional preparedness in the present sample. The results imply that exposure to understandable language and the use of appropriate instructional strategies may be relevant to pronunciation-related preparedness, although the observed associations are modest. This is consistent with the discussion of pronunciation development by Johnson et al. (2018), who emphasized the role of phonetic knowledge in language processing, and Mahmood (2024), who highlighted the importance of meaningful acoustic exposure. Nevertheless, the present findings do not establish that these instructional dimensions directly improve pronunciation.

Table 5. *Correlations Between English-Speaking Skills and Instructional Preparedness*

Preparedness Dimensions	*r*	*p*	Decision	Remark
Pronunciation				
Lesson Preparedness	.04	.649	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Building background	.19	.024	Reject H0	Significant
Comprehensible input	.26	.002	Reject H0	Significant
Strategies	.24	.003	Reject H0	Significant
Interaction	.14	.088	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Practice and application	.08	.336	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Lesson delivery	-.06	.462	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Vocabulary				
Lesson Preparedness	.05	.525	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Building background	.15	.063	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Comprehensible input	.18	.029	Reject H0	Significant
Strategies	.16	.056	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Interaction	.15	.074	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Practice and application	.16	.050	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Lesson delivery	-.04	.639	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Confidence				
Lesson Preparedness	-.04	.626	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Building background	.10	.226	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Comprehensible input	.18	.030	Reject H0	Significant
Strategies	.22	.007	Reject H0	Significant
Interaction	.13	.128	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Practice and application	.05	.519	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Lesson delivery	-.04	.605	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Grammar				
Lesson Preparedness	-.06	.474	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Building background	.12	.155	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Comprehensible input	.27	.001	Reject H0	Significant
Strategies	.22	.008	Reject H0	Significant
Interaction	.12	.164	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Practice and application	.15	.079	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Lesson delivery	.04	.671	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Diction				
Lesson Preparedness	.04	.620	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Building background	.09	.308	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Comprehensible input	.23	.005	Reject H0	Significant
Strategies	.17	.048	Reject H0	Significant
Interaction	.10	.225	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Practice and application	.06	.506	Failed to reject H0	Not significant
Lesson delivery	.07	.397	Failed to reject H0	Not significant

Note. Two-tailed Pearson correlations; α = .05. The Decision and Remark columns indicate whether each association met the stated significance threshold. The 35 comparisons were not adjusted for multiple testing.

In terms of Vocabulary. For vocabulary, only comprehensible input demonstrated a statistically significant positive relationship with instructional preparedness (r = .182, p = .029). This indicates a weak association between respondents' vocabulary ratings and their perceived preparedness in providing or using understandable language input. The remaining dimensions—lesson preparedness (r = .053, p = .525), building background (r = .155, p = .063), instructional strategies (r = .159, p = .056), interaction (r = .149, p = .074), practice and application (r = .163, p = .050), and lesson delivery (r = −.039, p = .639)—were not statistically significant at the .05 level. In particular, the relationship between vocabulary and practice and application was not considered significant based on the reported p = .050 and the study's decision rule. Although some coefficients were positive, their corresponding significance values did not meet the criterion for rejecting the null hypothesis. These findings suggest that vocabulary-related skills may have a limited association with perceived preparedness in comprehensible input, while the other instructional dimensions did not demonstrate sufficient evidence of a relationship in this sample. Meaningful exposure to language may give learners opportunities to encounter and understand words in context. This is consistent with the importance of meaningful language exposure discussed by Kansızoğlu and Bekiroğlu (2025). However, the relatively small coefficient indicates that vocabulary alone does not explain much variation in perceived instructional preparedness.

In terms of Confidence. The results for confidence showed statistically significant positive relationships with comprehensible input (r = .181, p = .030) and instructional strategies (r = .223, p = .007). Both coefficients indicate weak positive associations, with instructional strategies showing the stronger relationship. These findings suggest that respondents who reported higher confidence in their English-speaking skills also tended to report higher preparedness in comprehensible input and instructional strategies. However, lesson preparedness (r = −.041, p = .626), building background (r = .101, p = .226), interaction (r = .127, p = .128), practice and application (r = .054, p = .519), and lesson delivery (r = −.043, p = .605) did not demonstrate statistically significant relationships with confidence. This indicates that confidence was not significantly associated with these five dimensions in the present study. The findings suggest that understandable language input and the use of appropriate learning and teaching strategies may be relevant to respondents' confidence in speaking English. Previous discussions by Anam and Stracke (2020) have highlighted the relevance of instructional approaches and language-learning strategies to learners' language development. Nevertheless, the weak correlations observed in this study indicate that confidence is not strongly associated with any single dimension of instructional preparedness. Other personal, social, and learning-related circumstances may also contribute to respondents' confidence, although these were not directly examined in the present analysis.

In terms of Grammar. Regarding grammar, statistically significant positive relationships were identified with comprehensible input (r = .268, p = .001) and instructional strategies (r = .218, p = .008). Although both relationships were statistically significant, their coefficients indicate weak associations. Comprehensible input showed the strongest correlation among the seven preparedness dimensions examined in relation to grammar. This suggests that respondents with higher self-reported grammar ratings also tended to report higher preparedness in providing comprehensible input and applying instructional strategies. Meanwhile, lesson preparedness (r = −.060, p = .474), building background (r = .119, p = .155), interaction (r = .116, p = .164), practice and application (r = .146, p = .079), and lesson delivery (r = .036, p = .671) showed no statistically significant relationships with grammar. These findings indicate that the respondents' grammar ratings were not significantly associated with these particular dimensions of instructional preparedness. The results highlight the possible relevance of understandable language input and strategic instructional practices to grammar-related preparedness. As Zam et al. (2021) noted, speaking involves both producing and receiving language during communication. Thus, opportunities to encounter and use language meaningfully may support the development of grammatical awareness in oral communication. However, the present findings do not demonstrate that comprehensible input or instructional strategies independently determine grammatical competence or instructional readiness.

In terms of Diction. The results for diction revealed statistically significant positive relationships with comprehensible input (r = .235, p = .005) and instructional strategies (r = .165, p = .048). Both coefficients indicate weak associations, with comprehensible input demonstrating the stronger relationship. These findings suggest that higher self-reported diction ratings were associated with higher perceived preparedness in these two instructional dimensions. In contrast, lesson preparedness (r = .041, p = .620), building background (r = .085, p = .308), interaction (r = .101, p = .225), practice and application (r = .056, p = .506), and lesson delivery (r = −.071, p

= .397) did not show statistically significant relationships with diction. This suggests that the respondents' diction ratings were not significantly associated with these dimensions of instructional preparedness. The findings indicate that understandable language input and instructional strategies may be relevant to diction-related preparedness, particularly in developing appropriate word choice and expression. Panggua et al. (2023) emphasized the importance of exposure to language models in developing knowledge of pronunciation, vocabulary, and phrasing. Similarly, Rayati et al. (2022) discussed the role of language-learning strategies in supporting learners' awareness and use of language. Nevertheless, the weak correlations suggest these relationships are limited in strength and should not be interpreted as evidence that the identified instructional dimensions directly improve diction.

In terms of Overall Interpretation. Overall, the findings indicate that comprehensible input and instructional strategies were the two instructional-preparedness dimensions that demonstrated statistically significant relationships across all five English-speaking dimensions. Building background was significantly associated only with pronunciation, while lesson preparedness, interaction, practice and application, and lesson delivery showed no statistically significant relationships with any of the five speaking-related dimensions. Among the significant results, the strongest observed association was between grammar and comprehensible input ($r = .268$, $p = .001$), followed by pronunciation and comprehensible input ($r = .261$, $p = .002$). Nevertheless, these coefficients still represent weak positive relationships, indicating that the statistical associations have limited strength. Furthermore, the absence of statistically significant relationships does not mean the instructional-preparedness dimensions are unimportant; rather, the results indicate that the study found insufficient statistical evidence of linear associations between those particular pairs of variables. Considering that 35 pairwise correlations were examined without a reported adjustment for multiple comparisons, the significant findings should be treated as exploratory and interpreted with caution. Taken together, the results suggest that English-speaking skills and perceived instructional preparedness are related in selected dimensions, but the relationships are neither uniformly significant nor strong. Thus, instructional preparedness should not be understood solely in terms of speaking-related skills, as other competencies and contextual factors may also contribute to pre-service teachers' readiness to teach.

Pre-Service Teachers' Experiences in Acquiring English-Speaking Skills

The qualitative analysis produced the overarching theme "Multimodal Learning and Psychological Growth," supported by three subthemes: passive and active exposure, interactive communication, and emotional resilience and confidence. The themes capture respondents' descriptions of how they encounter English, use it with others, and manage the emotional demands of speaking. They provide context for interpreting the questionnaire findings, particularly the contrast between regular media exposure and comparatively lower self-reported confidence.

In terms of Passive and Active Exposure. Respondents described watching movies, listening to podcasts, reading English books, broadcasting, and participating in demonstration teaching as ways to encounter and use English. One participant referred to movies, podcasts, and public speakers (R23), while another mentioned reading, broadcasting, and demonstration teaching (R19). These accounts illustrate the range of learning experiences respondents associated with speaking development. Ahmadi (2018) reviewed the use of technology in English language learning. Ibrahim and Hashim (2021) examined authentic videoconferencing as a way to support speaking practice. In the present study, media exposure appears to provide access to spoken language, while academic tasks offer opportunities to apply language in more purposeful contexts.

In terms of Interactive Communication. Participants described peer communication and online discourse as opportunities to practice English. Respondent R27 described learning through interactions with peers from kindergarten to college, while R30 emphasized online discourse, dedication, and practice. Such accounts highlight the role of communication with others in developing familiarity and willingness to use English. Malik et al. (2025) examined learners' perceived problems in speaking English. Shimray (2023) investigated online speaking tasks and English communication ability. These studies provide context for understanding why interactive activities may be valuable, although the present qualitative responses do not measure changes in fluency or proficiency.

Table 6. *Pre-Service Teachers' Experiences in Acquiring English-Speaking Skills*

Representative Statement	Categories	Subthemes	Universal Theme
Through watching movies and surrounding myself with esteemed public speakers, listening to various podcasts, and watching Filipino Movies with English translation (R23).	Media and Audio-Visual Immersion	Passive and Active Exposure	
By reading books in English, broadcasting, and I acquire speaking skills in every demo teaching, expressing your own thoughts towards others with no judgement (R19).	Literary and Academic Engagement	Passive and Active Exposure	
I learned to improve my speaking skills through communicating with my peers and social interactions from kindergarten to college (R27).	Social and Interpersonal Interaction	Interactive Communication	Multimodal Learning and Psychological Growth
Acquiring English speaking skills can be significantly improved by online discourses that use the English language, dedication, and practice (R30).	Intentional Practice and Discourse	Interactive Communication	
I often feel nervous and embarrassed because I'm scared I'll make a mistake and be judged, and my thoughts get tangled so I can't express myself clearly (R21).	Psychological and Cognitive Barriers	Emotional Resilience and Confidence	
Whenever someone supports me or gives kind feedback, I feel more confident and communicate without feeling ashamed of their words and pronunciation (R25).	Support Systems and Confidence Building	Emotional Resilience and Confidence	

Note. Qualitative thematic analysis derived from pre-service teachers' responses

In terms of Emotional Resilience and Confidence. The third subtheme concerned nervousness, fear of mistakes, and concern about being judged. Respondent R21 described becoming nervous and losing the ability to express ideas clearly when anticipating mistakes or negative evaluation. In contrast, R25 explained that supportive feedback helped build confidence and reduced embarrassment about word choice and pronunciation. Hutabarat and Simanjuntak (2019) explored speaking anxiety among English learners. Dewaele et al. (2023) discussed the roles of anxiety, enjoyment, and boredom in language learning. Tabuchi et al. (2024) examined online conversation lessons as a way to address language anxiety and speaking skills. These accounts suggest that emotional experiences shape respondents' descriptions of speaking development and should be considered alongside opportunities for language practice.

Taken together, the three subthemes show that respondents viewed English-speaking development as involving exposure, opportunities for interaction, and emotional support. The quantitative and qualitative strands complement one another: the questionnaire results show relatively frequent media exposure and comparatively lower self-reported confidence, while the open-ended responses describe both the usefulness of communication opportunities and the anxiety associated with speaking. This convergence is interpretive and does not prove that one experience produced a particular score. Teacher education activities may therefore provide varied language input, structured peer interaction, repeated speaking opportunities, and constructive feedback in settings where mistakes are treated as part of learning.

The implications should remain proportionate to the evidence. The findings do not demonstrate that a specific intervention will improve speaking proficiency or teaching performance, but they identify areas that teacher education programs may consider when planning learning experiences. Authentic speaking tasks, collaborative activities, and low-stakes opportunities to practice instructional explanations may help students connect language knowledge with classroom communication. Charcos and Charcos (2026) reported communication barriers and communication styles among English majors at the same campus, offering a related institutional perspective. Further evaluation would be needed to determine whether targeted activities lead to measurable improvements in oral proficiency or classroom practice.

Conclusion

This study contributes localized evidence on how self-reported English-speaking skills and perceived instructional preparedness intersect among fourth-year pre-service teachers at Cebu Technological University–Tuburan Campus. The central finding is not that all language-related skills correspond with all aspects of teaching readiness, but that selected dimensions are associated while others are not. Comprehensible input and strategies appeared in several significant pairings, although the observed coefficients were small and should be interpreted cautiously.

The qualitative accounts add an important dimension to this interpretation. Respondents described media exposure, academic speaking activities, peer interaction, and online communication as part of their learning experiences. They also reported nervousness, fear of mistakes, and the value of supportive feedback. These accounts indicate that linguistic self-perceptions, perceived instructional preparedness, and affective experiences are related but distinct aspects of pre-service teacher development. A positive self-rating in instructional preparedness should not be taken as evidence of objectively demonstrated speaking proficiency or teaching competence.

For teacher education practice, the findings support providing regular and authentic opportunities to speak English, rehearse instructional explanations, engage in collaborative classroom tasks, and receive specific, constructive feedback. Lesson-planning exercises may also address measurable objectives, pacing, and the organization of lesson components, which were comparatively lower-rated areas in the descriptive results. These are practical considerations suggested by the findings, not established causal solutions.

The study is limited by its single-campus context, reliance on self-reported questionnaire data, and correlational design. The results should not automatically generalize to pre-service teachers in other institutions, nor should the observed associations be interpreted causally. Future studies may involve multiple teacher education institutions, direct assessments of English-speaking proficiency, classroom observations of instructional performance, and longitudinal designs that follow language development and teaching preparedness over time. Such approaches could clarify whether and how changes in speaking competence correspond with changes in demonstrated instructional practice.

Contributions of Authors

Author 1 (Lead Author): Conceptualization, research design, proposal writing, methodology, data gathering, data analysis and interpretation, manuscript writing, and final manuscript preparation.
Author 2: Data gathering, data analysis, and interpretation of findings.
Author 3: Proposal development, literature review, and data gathering.
Author 4: Data gathering, validation of research instruments, and manuscript review.
Author 5: Data gathering, organization of research data, and manuscript review and editing.
Author 6 (Research Adviser): Supervision, guidance in research conceptualization and methodology, validation of the research process, critical review, and final approval of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

The researchers express their sincere gratitude to Dr. Ma. Carla Y. Abaquita, campus director, for her vital support and encouragement; Dr. Adelliosa G. Menchavez, College of Education dean and panelist, for authorizing the survey; and Dr. Angen May F. Charcos, research adviser and grammarian, for her dedicated guidance and editorial assistance. Special thanks are also extended to research coordinator and panelist Dr. Jude Charrel B. Paez, panelists Dr. Antonio P. Cinco Jr. and Mr. Leo T. Zosa, and statistician Dr. Charina G. Bardoquillo for their invaluable insights and expertise. To Dr. Johnrel M. Paglinawan and Mrs. Alyssa Marie Paglinawan for providing the necessary assistance with the TurnitIn tools. Furthermore, the researchers acknowledge Cebu Technological University–Tuburan Campus and the 4th Year College of Education pre-service teachers for their willingness to participate. Above all, profound gratitude is offered to the Almighty God for His endless guidance, strength, and blessings throughout the research journey.

References

Adinda, M., & Ahmad, Z. (2024). The importance of teaching English pronunciation by using English in Mind textbook. Prosiding Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya (KOLITA), 22(Prosiding KOLITA 22), 233–238. https://doi.org/10.25170/kolita.22.5979

Ahmadi, M.R. (2018). The use of technology in English language learning: A literature review. International Journal of Research in English Education, 3(2), 115–125. https://doi.org/10.29252/ijree.3.2.115

Alaon, C.L., Delos Santos, J., & San Jose, A. (2023). Improving speaking communication skills in English through self-directed strategy. International Journal of Educational Innovation and Research, 2(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.31949/ijeir.v2i1.2920

Anam, S., & Stracke, E. (2020). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in learning English as a foreign language among young Indonesians. TESOL Journal, 11(1), e440. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.440

Charcos, A.M., & Charcos, J. (2026). Communication styles and perceived instructional challenges of English majors at CTU-Tuburan. Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science - Social Sciences, 16(12).

De Leon, J.M., & Olegario, L. (2024). Enhancing English speaking skills and confidence through collaborative speech activities. Philippine Journal of Education Studies, 2(2), 64–94.

Dewaele, J.-M., Botes, E., & Meftah, R. (2023). A three-body problem: The effects of foreign language anxiety, enjoyment, and boredom on academic achievement. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 43, 7–22. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190523000016

Echevarría, J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D.J. (2017). Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model (5th ed.). Pearson.

Fatihatus, & Havid. (2020). The analysis of students' pronunciation error on English diphthong made by fifth semester of English Language Education Program Universitas Negeri Padang. Journal of English Language Teaching, 9(1), 188–194. https://doi.org/10.24036/jelt.v9i1.107829

Halamury, M., & Sahertian, C.D. (2021). Lesson study berbasis saintifik bagi guru pendidikan agama Kristen di Sekolah Dasar. KURIOS (Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Agama Kristen), 7(2), Art. 2. https://doi.org/10.30995/kur.v7i2.324

Hutabarat, A., & Simanjuntak, D.C. (2019). A phenomenological study: Speaking anxiety overwhelms English learners. Acuity: Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture, 4(1), 44–58. https://doi.org/10.35974/acuity.v4i1.679

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269–293). Penguin Books.

Ibrahim, S.K.S., & Hashim, H. (2021). Enhancing English as a second language learners' speaking skills through authentic videoconferencing. Creative Education, 12(3), 545–556. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2021.123037

Istiqomah, W. (2024). Students' speaking anxiety and its effect on speaking performance based on their gender. Retain: Journal of Research in English Language Teaching, 12(2), 24–29. https://doi.org/10.26740/rt.v12i02.62136

Johnson, K.A., Mellesmoen, G.M., Lo, R. Y.-H., & Gick, B. (2018). Prior pronunciation knowledge bootstraps word learning. Frontiers in Communication, 3, Article 1. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2018.00001

Kansızoğlu, N., & Bekiroğlu, N. (2025). The effect of vocabulary development interventions on cognitive outcomes of vocabulary: A meta-analysis study. Journal of Pedagogical Research, 9(1), 123–148. https://doi.org/10.33902/JPR.202532083

Kenoh, A.R.I. (2021). A qualitative study on speaking anxiety among pre-service teachers. Journal of Learning and Development Studies, 1(1), 34–39.

Krashen, S.D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Pergamon Press.

Mahmood, R.Q. (2024). ESL learners' perceptions of using high-variability phonetic training (HVPT) through YouGlish to improve pronunciation skills. Australian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 7(3), Article 1818. https://doi.org/10.29140/ajal.v7n3.1818

Malik, E., Rohmatillah, R., & Rahmawati, I.N. (2025). An analysis of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners' problems in speaking skills based on their perception at senior high school. Edunesia Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan, 6(1), 190–206. https://doi.org/10.51276/edu.v6i1.1106

Meniado, J. (2019). Demographic variables and English proficiency of adult language learners: A correlational study. Education Quarterly Reviews, 2(1), 52–66. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1292367

Nzamurabaho, I., & Ali, L. (2024). Survey of factors affecting English-speaking skills of Grade 9 students in day schools of Gisagara District, Rwanda. Journal of Research Innovation and Implications in Education, 8(3), 212–226.

Orge, P.M., Pameron, J.P.A., & Vcocolan, J. (2024). Challenges in speaking English language among education students. Mediterranean Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 8(3), 33–41. https://doi.org/10.46382/mjbas.2024.8304

Panganoron-Jabonete, N. (2022). Instructional strategies and integration of critical thinking skills of preservice English teachers. Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 4(3), 114–119.

Panggua, S., Aeni, N., Rachel, R., Teko Patanduk, S., Ratu Tandi Arrang, J., Tulaktondok, L., & Sirande, N. (2023). The perceived impact of comprehensible input on EFL students' listening and speaking skills. In M. Kristiawan et al. (Eds.), Proceedings of the Online Conference of Education Research International (OCERI 2023) (pp. 613–623). Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-108-1_60

Rahman, M.M., Singh, M.K.M., & Pandian, A. (2018). Exploring ESL teacher beliefs and classroom practices of CLT: A case study. International Journal of Instruction, 11(1), 295–310. https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11121a

Rayati, M., Abedi, H., & Aghazadeh, S. (2022). EFL learners' speaking strategies: A study of low and high proficiency learners. MEXTESOL Journal, 46(4). https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v46n4-5

Santos, A., Fernandez, V., & Ilustre, R. (2022). English language proficiency in the Philippines: An overview. International Journal of English Language Studies, 4(3), 46–51.

Sebastian, M.A., & Villa, E.A. (2025). Teaching preparedness, demographic, and academic factors on teaching competencies: A structural equation modelling approach. International Journal of Studies in Education and Science, 6(1), 79–103.

Shimray, Y.P. (2023). The effectiveness of online speaking tasks (OST) on English communication ability of Thai EFL undergraduates. IJELTAL (Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics), 8(2), 25–40. https://doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal.v8i2.1445

Tabuchi, K., Kobayashi, S., Fukuda, S., & Nakagawa, Y. (2024). A case study on reducing language anxiety and enhancing speaking skills through online conversation lessons. Technology in Language Teaching & Learning, 6(3), 14–97. https://doi.org/10.29140/tltl.v6n3.1497

Torreces, R., & Brillantes, M.F. (2022). Degree of acquisition of the English language, attitude, and speaking proficiency of pre-service teachers in a state university in Iloilo, Philippines. International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews, 3(12), 824–837. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.2022.31218

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Zam, F.Z., Suriaman, A., Rofiqoh, R., & Budi, B. (2021). The correlation between grammar and speaking skill of undergraduate students. Exposure: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, 10(2), 250–262. https://doi.org/10.26618/exposure.v10i2.5676