



Education Quarterly Reviews

Cruz, K. D. L., & Basantes, M. C. (2026). Communicative Challenges and Fear of Performance among Pre-service English Teachers: The Role of Preparation. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 9(2), 64-75.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.09.02.718

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

Communicative Challenges and Fear of Performance among Pre-service English Teachers: The Role of Preparation *

Keren De La Cruz¹, Maria C. Basantes²

^{1,2} Facultad de Educación, Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí, Manta, Ecuador

E-mail: e1312274754@live.ulead.edu.ec, maria.basantes@uleam.edu.ec

Abstract

In schools, it is usual for universities to send some of their students from different pedagogical fields to different schools to provide their support and services. However, when these pre-service teachers are required to perform in front of an audience, some communication gaps might arise due to unpreparedness. The present goal of the major in Pedagogy of National and Foreign Languages at Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí is to provide the community with well-prepared teachers able to boldly cope with communication barriers in mainstream education. The current research aims to analyze the factors that generate fear of performance and communicative challenges in pre-service teachers and explore their perceptions of these factors related to their teacher training through a mixed approach selected through inclusion criteria focused on the communicative competence as a message deliverer, message receiver, teacher, and university student. Two instruments were applied to collect information: a questionnaire and an interview. The study sample consisted of 40 students from the Pedagogy of the National and Foreign Languages program at Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí. The results identified many communicative challenges faced by students during their practicum, such as feeling nervous when interacting with or having their classes observed by authorities without getting enough feedback, as well as the lack of training for dealing with parents.

Keywords: Communicative Challenges, Pre-Service, English Teacher, Preparation

1. Introduction

In the current context of English Language Teacher Education, communicative skills are essential, as they are evident across both academic and professional life. As Fatimayin (2018) emphasized, communication is the ability to use language effectively to express ideas. Still, it also involves conveying messages through various means such as speech, signals, signs, writing, or behavior. In educational contexts, this ability becomes especially important for teachers as effective communication is necessary not only when teaching classes but also when interacting with parents, other teachers, students during individual tutoring, and giving conferences or presentations. Proficiency in communication is essential for achieving mutual understanding, cooperation, and positive outcomes

* This article is associated with the research project Innovaciones Pedagógicas e Internacionalización de la Formación de Docentes para el Desarrollo Humano Sostenible (Pedagogical Innovations and Internationalization of Teacher Education for Human and Sustainable Development)

in both professional and personal contexts (Estelito J., 2025). However, many pre-service teachers face difficulties when expressing themselves in public. This may be due to different factors, such as fear of making mistakes or being judged (for example, for their pronunciation, lack of fluency, or insecurity when speaking). This problem may be intensified in the context of a second language, since it combines the anxiety of public speaking with the fear of making mistakes in a language that is still being learned.

The premise of this study is that the lack of preparation and learning of appropriate techniques contributes to communicative challenges and fear of performance among pre-service teachers. Yimer (2016) emphasizes the impact of opportunities to have contact with students in real teaching scenarios during teacher training to help them analyze and understand what teaching implies. He mentions that it is essential to assess the likelihood of practicing in real-life scenarios provided to teachers during their training. This assumption is aligned with the Experiential Learning Theory by David Kolb, which describes learning as a cyclical process of learning experiences. It states that there is a cycle that the learner must go through for learning to be effective. This cycle includes two opposing dimensions of grasping experience (concrete experience and abstract conceptualization) and two opposing dimensions of transforming experience (reflective observation and active experimentation) (McCarthy, 2016).

Previous studies have shown that communicative challenges and fear of performance among pre-service teachers are common problems. To cite one example, educators often must interact with parents; these interactions are among the most challenging aspects; however, they play a key role in a child's educational life. Interaction between educators and parents often happens during parent-teacher conferences or office hours (Major, 2023); many future teachers may not feel ready to deal with parents, since during their teaching practice, they have little practical experience engaging with them (Mehlig, 2013). Another challenge faced by pre-service teachers is intercultural communication. A study conducted in Türkiye and the USA highlights the importance of paying attention to the word choices when communicating, particularly the use of pronouns, since these can include or exclude individuals in intercultural contexts. Subsequently, it is vital to prepare students to adopt and practice language choices (Uzum B, 2024). Moreover, most pre-service teachers have little or non-existent exposure to urban areas and culturally diverse communities, which requires them to change the way they talk and think about urban education (Pink, 2004). A very common issue is second language management. Many students experience difficulties using the language effectively, which ultimately affects their teaching performance. Due to a lack of fluency in the language, pre-service teachers tend to make long pauses, which causes the listener to lose interest in the message (Muñoz, 2018). Furthermore, it is mentioned by Christan (2015) that pre-service teachers require continuous feedback to improve their classroom interaction skills as they demonstrate limited use of communication strategies during their training. This suggests that communicative challenges are recurring difficulties that affect pre-service teachers' classroom performance. Considering these factors, it is important to address this issue, since according to the curricular plan, the objective of the Pedagogy of National and Foreign Languages program at Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí (2023) is to train third-level professionals who carry the responsibility of improving English Language learning for future generations of students in the general education system. Therefore, preparing teachers who can face communicative challenges with confidence is of great importance.

After reviewing the curriculum of the Pedagogy of National and Foreign Languages program in the Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro; which was updated in 2023, it was observed that the professional training of students is structured around four specific areas: (1) language proficiency, (2) mastery of methodologies and strategies for teaching English, (3) knowledge and understanding of linguistic components and branches, and (4) the ability to develop research projects and their corresponding publication. Within these training areas, although there are courses in which teachers can focus on improving oral skills, such as English levels and those related to teaching methodologies, there are no subjects specifically focused on overcoming communicative challenges, such as those mentioned before. However, the main intention of this study is not to propose creating a whole subject focused on this, but to analyze the factors that generate fear of performance in pre-service teachers, while identifying the communicative challenges they face, describing the extent to which preparation affects their confidence and performance, and exploring their perceptions of the communicative challenges related to their teacher training at Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí in 2025.

To that extent, we can develop strategies that can be implemented within the program and existing courses to help address this need. This study aims to answer these three specific questions: (1) What are the communicative challenges faced by pre-service teachers? (2) To what extent does preparation affect pre-service teachers' confidence and performance? and (3) How do students perceive communicative challenges related to their teaching training? These research questions are central because they are directly related to the objective and guide the analysis of the factors affecting pre-service teachers' performance. To answer these questions, this study applies a mixed-method approach by applying questionnaires and interviews. This approach allows the analysis of key variables while also helping with a deeper exploration of students' perceptions of communicative challenges. The findings of this study are expected to help the language program of ULEAM University understand which challenges their students are facing and apply new strategies to overcome these obstacles.

2. Method

The conceptual and operational definitions of the variables used in this study were selected through inclusion criteria, such as the analysis of the studies published between 2015 and 2025 to guarantee updated data. Furthermore, any kind of academic literature reviewed by peers was accepted. Additionally, the selected research was focused on communicative competence as a message deliverer, message receiver, teacher, and university student. Regarding the language, only those conducted in English and Spanish were allowed.

2.1 Participants

This study was done in Manta, Ecuador. The inclusion criteria for participants were: (1) being a student in the sixth or seventh semester of the Language Teaching program; (2) having completed the coursework corresponding to the first through fourth semesters; (3) having participated in the teaching practicum; and (4) being willing to participate voluntarily in this study. A total of 40 students aged 20 to 38 participated in the study, including 31 females and 9 males.

2.2 Sampling Procedures

A combination of convenience and purposive sampling methods was used to select the participants. The convenience sampling method is a technique where participants are selected based on how easy it is to gather them (Golzar, 2022). On the other hand, purposive sampling involves selecting participants based on inclusion criteria relevant to the study objectives (Prita S. Nurcandrani, 2026). The participants were selected from the Language Teaching program (Pedagogy of the National and Foreign Languages) at Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí. The data were collected in the classrooms where the students of the sixth and seventh semesters received regular classes. No teachers were present during interviews or questionnaires, as some of them act as supervisors of the practicum. Consequently, 100% of the sample participated.

2.2.1 Sample size, power, and precision

The instruments were applied to 40 students from different classrooms, 25 students from the sixth semester, and 15 students from the seventh semester. Although they were applied to different groups, participants were selected under the same inclusion criteria.

2.2.2 Measures and Data Collection

There were two instruments to collect information: a questionnaire and an interview. Both instruments were reviewed and revised by a specialist in the language program. Subsequently, the instruments were approved. The first data collection tool employed in this study was a questionnaire adapted from the instrument previously published in "*Design of a Questionnaire to Assess Oral Communication Competence in Pre-service Teachers*" (Bandrés, 2021). The adapted version differs from the original in that it includes two additional indicators within the Likert scale (1-7), as well as a contextualized modification for Ecuadorian students. This adaptation

incorporates additional variables, such as ethnicity, CEFR level, and type of institution, with particular emphasis on oral communication.

The instrument is designed to assess pre-service teachers' self-perceived oral communication competence (27 items) and their evaluation of the training received in this domain during their university studies (4 items). The original questionnaire demonstrates a very high level of internal consistency for the overall oral communication scale ($\alpha = .913$). Its subdimensions exhibit good to excellent reliability coefficients (a range from .78 to .91), while the scale measuring perceived training shows exceptional reliability ($\alpha = .941$).

Additionally, a second instrument was applied for data collection: a semi-structured interview adapted from the instrument used in "*Assessing Participants' Experiences in a Service-Learning Programme: A Psychometric Evaluation*" (Colman, 2018). This adapted version reduces the number of questions from 22 to 7 and is contextualized to the pre-professional teaching practicum of students enrolled in the National and Foreign Language Pedagogy program. The purpose of the interview is to explore pre-service teachers' perceptions of the communicative challenges encountered during their practicum, with particular emphasis on the development of communication skills, communication anxiety, the professional roles assumed when interacting with parents, and the institutional support received throughout their university education.

2.3 Research design and data analysis

Questionnaires were applied during the first term of the 2025(2) academic period. First, participants were informed about the purpose of the study. Second, the questionnaire was applied during class hours with the permission of the professors. It was not applied to both semesters jointly, but rather separately. The questionnaire was distributed in printed format to all students, who were given approximately 30 minutes to complete it. The interview was conducted under the same conditions as the questionnaire, during the second term of the 2025 (2) period. The instructions and questions of the interview were projected onto the screen, and the questions were read aloud one by one. Students were invited to answer voluntarily. The interview was recorded for subsequent analysis.

3. Results

3.1 Recruitment

The search, adaptation, and validation of the instruments started in July 2025, followed by the application of the first instrument, the questionnaire. Subsequently, the recruitment process was conducted on November 26, 2025, at Universidad Laica Eloy Alfaro de Manabí. Participants were selected following the inclusion criteria mentioned above. After receiving the necessary information about the study, a total of 40 students were willing to participate. The questionnaire was applied face-to-face during the class hours. The second instrument applied was the interview, whose recruitment process was conducted on January 28, 2026. It was applied to the same participants and under the same conditions: face-to-face, during class hours, and both semesters separately.

3.2 Statistics and Data Analysis

To carry out the analysis of the questionnaire, an Excel file was created, including all the 29 questions. Subsequently, the questions in which the number of low responses was 10 or higher were identified. Different variables were considered, such as age and gender; however, the variable that stood out the most and was the most suitable for addressing the hypothesis was employment status: *20 were the students who worked, and 20 were the ones who did not*. Of the 29 questions, 9 were selected for analysis, namely, questions 1, 10, 12, 13, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 27.

Regarding Question 1, 25% of the participants reported low levels of confidence when taking the floor. When divided by the employment variable, a marked difference can be observed: of that 25%, 20% of the low responses correspond to students who work, while 80% correspond to students who do not work. Similarly, in Question 10, a significant difference can be observed. In this item, 27,5% of the students expressed low confidence when participating in class, of whom 27,27% were working students and 72,73% were non-working students.

Question 12 was the item that registered the highest number of low responses, as 52,5% of the students indicated feeling unprepared to defend a project before a panel. Of this group, 28,57% correspond to students who work, while 71,43% do not. In Question 13, 30% of the participants indicated difficulties communicating in academic situations as university students, with 33,33% being working students and 66,67% non-working students.

Regarding teaching-related communicative skills, in Question 17, 30% of the students showed difficulties in maintaining students' attention; of these, 41,67% work and 58,33% do not. In Question 19, 27,5% showed low confidence in carrying out a class without assistance, of whom 27,27% correspond to working students and 72,73% to non-working students. In relation to professional communication contexts, Question 21 shows that 25% of the students feel insecure in meeting with parents; 40% of these students work, while 60% do not. Likewise, Question 22 indicated that 30% feel insecure in meeting with other teachers, with 25% being working students and 75% non-working students.

Finally, regarding students' perceptions of their academic training, Question 27 shows that 32,5% are not satisfied with the training received and do not consider that the courses in the program have helped them develop the oral communicative skills required of a teacher. In this case, the difference between groups is not as marked, as 46,15% corresponds to working students and 53,85% to non-working students.

Additionally, to address the objective and research questions outlined in the introduction, and to gain a deeper understanding of students' perceptions, an interview was conducted. The interview was recorded with the participants' consent for subsequent analysis. Questions 1 and 2 explore the communicative challenges that students experienced during their practicum. In Question 1.1, emphasis is placed on communication challenges with both the university mentor and the school mentor. Several students mentioned feeling nervous when communicating with the university mentor. They also indicated that it was sometimes difficult to locate them, which made processes such as signing practicum documents or discussing practicum-related issues more difficult. Other students mentioned a lack of consideration on the part of the school mentor, who assigned too many tasks without considering the students' university responsibilities. Another issue mentioned repeatedly was the lack of communication between the university mentor and the school mentor during the practicum, which resulted in insufficient feedback. Finally, another recurring theme was that some school mentors were very close-minded, which hindered open communication and collaboration.

Question 1.2 is related to the previous one but focuses on communicative difficulties when interacting with parents. In this question, few responses were obtained as most students mentioned that they did not have the opportunity to interact with parents. However, it was noted that communicating problems related to their children was difficult, and that interaction was easier when dealing with parents they already knew. From the communicative challenges mentioned above, in Question 2, students concluded that the greatest difficulties occurred with mentors, both from the university and the school.

In relation to fear of performance and communicative anxiety, Question 3 explores the situations in which fear of performance was most evident. The responses can be divided into two groups: demonstrative classes and interaction in English. In the first group, situations were mentioned such as when students were not paying attention, when students had a low level of English, when they showed little interest, when another teacher, such as the mentor, was observing the class, and when the pre-service teacher had little control of the classroom. In the second group, some students reported feeling nervous when interacting with teachers in bilingual schools, when interacting with students in English, and when speaking only in English while teaching a class.

In Question 4, students were asked which roles they considered necessary when interacting with parents. Since most did not have the opportunity to do so, they were asked to provide their opinion. The question included options such as educator, advisor, mediator, authority figure, and institutional representative. Several students stated that all of them were necessary, but with balance. Those who had the opportunity to interact with parents during their practicum mentioned that, as students, it was difficult to assume the role of an authority figure. In Question 4.2, students were asked what type of communicative style they used and whether it was effective. Those who had

interacted with parents, both during the practicum and those who were already working, responded. One participant mentioned trying to explain what the child had done wrong, although they indicated that it was not very effective. Another mentioned that being direct, without being too harsh, had worked, although this could be because it was someone they already knew.

In Question 5, students were asked which specific communicative skills they consider necessary to perform those roles when interacting with parents effectively. This question included several options, such as clear and accessible language, active listening, emotional intelligence and empathy, assertive and respectful communication, and problem-solving skills. After a brief explanation of each, students concluded that all these skills were necessary. During the interview, an additional question of great importance emerged: whether they believed that the university had helped them develop all the communicative skills required in school contexts. After reflecting, students concluded that the university had not sufficiently supported this development, and the program focuses more on academic aspects (such as lesson planning).

In relation to development and preparation, Question 6 explores the communication skills that students developed or strengthened during their practicum. Several skills were mentioned, for instance, classroom management, organizational skills, and confidence when interacting with students, active listening, with teachers and students; problem solving, emotional intelligence, and the ability to recognize emotions, especially with children.

Question 7 is divided into two parts. In Question 7.1, students were asked to mention what type of support they received from the university to deal with communicative challenges. The responses are varied. Some students reported that they did not receive support and that they were not provided with sufficient feedback. Others indicated that, in some schools, mentors did not have a strong level of English, which limited the support they could offer. On the other hand, a few students mentioned that the school mentor provided advice and helped them with the necessary materials. Question 7.2 addressed performance anxiety. The responses were similar, as most students reported not receiving support, and only in certain private schools did students receive assistance with materials and some activities.

Finally, in Question 8, students mentioned the support they would have liked to receive, such as weekly feedback, more guidance, and greater involvement from the university in monitoring what mentors do, as well as being more present during the practicum.

4. Discussion

The results obtained from both the questionnaire and the interview made it possible to meet the research objectives focused on the factors that generate fear of performance in pre-service teachers and the identification of the communicative challenges they face. Regarding the research questions, these were also addressed and allowed the development of several discussion points, particularly in relation to the extent to which preparation affects pre-service teachers' confidence and performance as well as how students perceive communicative challenges related to their teaching training. These findings also appear to align with the experiential learning theory, which emphasizes the importance of experience, practice, and active participation in the learning process, as mentioned in the introduction section. In this sense, the results suggest that the lack of preparation and learning of appropriate techniques contributes to communicative challenges and fear of performance among pre-service teachers.

The analysis of the questionnaire shows that, in relation to communicative challenges, there is a marked difference: most of the low scores correspond to non-working students, while only a few working students reported low responses. However, in Question 27, the difference is minimal, indicating that both working and non-working students feel dissatisfied with university courses. Similarly, when considering the interview responses, in which students reported not receiving sufficient support and emphasized that the university has not helped them develop the necessary skills for teaching, it can be concluded that oral communicative skills do not appear to be significantly developed within the program. The questionnaire results show that students who perform better are those who work. This suggests that work experience functions as a more effective learning environment. It is important to consider that these are university students and not all of them have access to employment

opportunities; therefore, it is concerning that communicative competence is primarily developed in workplace contexts.

Furthermore, a gap can be identified between theoretical training and the real demands of the educational context. Students mentioned in the interview that the university tends to focus more on academic aspects. The curriculum includes subjects focused on lesson planning based on English skills. However, students indicated that, although they are taught how to design classes, they are not sufficiently prepared for interaction in real contexts.

When focusing on the practicum, the interview data shows that students are not fully included in all aspects of teaching practice. Although schools allow them to teach classes, they are not involved in meetings with parents or other teachers, which are essential components of the teaching profession. A significant issue in teaching training programs is the lack of preparation in relation to communication with families. Several pre-service teachers begin their practicum with limited knowledge and confidence to engage with parents in discussions about students' academic progress. Besides, during their teaching training process, students do not have enough opportunities to practice interaction with parents, especially in situations related to assessment (Mehlig, 2013) limits the development of confidence and oral performance in professional contexts. Another issue that could be identified was the lack of communication between pre-service teachers and school mentors. Students mentioned that some mentors were inflexible, making collaboration difficult, while others were not considerate of students' time, ignoring other responsibilities that they may have. In both cases, it is evident that there was no effective communication between students and school mentors; this can directly affect students' workflow and confidence during the practicum (Karunagaran, 2019). Additionally, students do not receive sufficient feedback, neither from the university nor from the school, which is essential for pre-service teachers. While students may recognize some of their own mistakes, this does not replace the guidance of a professional. It can be observed that it is more effectively developed through constant exposure to real communicative environments. The results show that students who work report lower levels of insecurity, suggesting that continuous exposure to the workplace is a key factor in the development of communicative self-efficacy. Self-efficacy theory by Albert Bandura suggests that for effective performance, possessing the necessary skills is not enough; individuals must also believe in their capacity to use those skills, particularly in challenging situations (Bhati, 2022). In this sense, the findings of this study support the idea that the lack of preparation and the absence of appropriate training techniques contribute to communicative challenges and fear of performance among pre-service teachers, as students who are exposed to real workplace environments not only develop communicative skills but also strengthen their confidence in using them. Therefore, the program must incorporate strategies that provide students with greater exposure to real contexts.

Concerning the limitations of this study, one of them was that, due to time and management constraints, the research could not be extended to students from other universities nationwide, which would have allowed a comparison between public and private institutions in the region. Thus, the analysis of the results of this study focused on comparing students who work and those who do not; however, it would have been interesting to include other questions in the interview related to, previous teaching experience or the number of practicum hours. In addition, the research mainly focused on students' perceptions and did not include direct classroom observations or mentor evaluations, which could have provided a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon. Finally, future research could analyze and compare different practicum instructor curricula to further examine this issue.

Overall, many factors related to fear of performance, along with several communicative challenges faced by pre-service teachers during their teacher training, were identified. Addressing this issue is essential for not interfering with the achievement of the program's objectives. To prepare educators qualified to carry the responsibility of improving English language learning for upcoming generations, students should be led to face communicative challenges confidently by developing effective strategies within the program and current courses.

Author contributions: All authors contributed to this study. They all collaborated on the adjustment and edition of the instruments and analysis of data, as well as the search for information. The final version of the manuscript was read and approved by all authors.

Funding: This study received no external funding; the study was conducted independently.

Informed consent statement/Ethics approval: The objectives and purpose of the study were clearly informed to all participants before data collection. Their voluntary participation and consent were ensured before any intervention.

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-assisted Technologies: This study has not used any generative AI tools or technologies in the preparation of this manuscript.

References

- Bandrés, I. O. (2021). Design of a Questionnaire to Assess the Oral Communication Competence of Teacher Education Students. *Educação & Formação.*, 6(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25053/redufor.v6i1.3490>
- Bárkányi, Z., & Brash, B. (2025). Foreign language speaking anxiety, mental health, and online learning: Overcoming barriers in the digital age. *Language Teaching*, 1-19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444825101080>
- Bhati, K. &. (2022). Self-efficacy: Theory to educational practice. . *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 10(1), 1123-1128. . DOI: 10.25215/1001.112
- Christan Grygas Coogle, N. L. (2015). Pre-service teacher use of communication strategies upon receiving immediate feedback. *sciencedirect*, 105-115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104632>
- Colman, L. T.-L. (2018). Assessing Participants' Experiences in a Service-Learning Program: A Psychometric Evaluation. *Journal of methods and measurement in the social sciences.*, 32.
- Estelito J., R. A. (2025). Communication Skills and Challenges of Pre-Service Teachers: A Basis for Developing a Communication Skills Enhancement Module. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.906000235>
- Fatimayin, F. (2018). What is communication. *National Open University of Nigeria*.
- Golzar, J., Noor, S., & Tajik, O. (2022). Convenience sampling. *International Journal of Education & Language Studies*, 1(2), 72-77. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/ijels.2022.162981>
- Karunagaran, V. &. (2019). Challenges of pre-service teachers during teaching practice: A case study. *Infrastructure University Kuala Lumpur Research Journal*, 7(2), 64-72.
- Major, E. (2023). Parent-teacher communication from the perspective of the educator. *Central European Journal of Educational Research*, 5(2), 13-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37441/cejerr/2023/5/2/13281>
- McCarthy, M. (2016). Experiential learning theory: From theory to practice. *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 14(3). *Journal of Business & Economics Research*, 14(3). DOI: <https://journals.klalliance.org/index.php/JBER/article/view/185>
- Mehlig, L. M. (2013). How is my child doing?: Preparing pre-service teachers to engage parents through assessment. *Teaching Education*, 24(2), 181-194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2013.786892>
- Muñoz, W. &. (2018). Transactional communication strategies to influence pre-service teachers' speaking skill. . *Gist: Education and Learning Research Journal*, (16), 33-55.
- Pink, W. T. (2004). Going Backstage: Enhancing Communicative Competence for Pre-Service Teachers. *Educational Foundations*, 18, 45-58.
- Prita S. Nurcandrani, W. M. (2026). Identity Negotiation and Resilience among Families with Stunted Children. *Asian institute of research*. DOI: 10.31014/aior.1991.09.01.632
- Uzum B, Y. B. (2024). "Teacher candidates' intercultural communication in telecollaboration: locating acts of positioning in translingual negotiations". *Journal for Multicultural Education*, Vol. 18 No. 1-2 pp. 53–66. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/JME-09-2023-0096>
- Yimer, M. (2016). Unveiling Pre-Service Teachers' Attitudes Toward Teaching: The Role of Pedagogical Practicums. *redalyc*, DOI: <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.15446/profile.v18n2.49591>

Appendix A: Questionnaire on Pre-Service Teachers' Self-Perceived Oral Communicative Competence, Confidence, and Performance Challenges

Age	Sex		Ethnicity				Semester	
	Male	Female	Mestizo	Afro	Mulatto	Montubio	Sixth	Seventh

Do you work and study at the same time?	yes	No	What is your institution dedicated to?	Education	Administrative tasks
Do you have contact with the public?	yes	No	What type of institution do you work in?	Public	Private

What CEFR level do you think you are at?	A1	A2	B1	B2	C1	C2
--	----	----	----	----	----	----

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Assessment of current verbal communicative competence in everyday life. competence as a sender of spoken messages. (1: Never – 7: Always)							
1	I feel confident when I have to speak.							
2	I express my ideas clearly and in an organized way.							
3	In general, I communicate well when speaking with other people.							
	Assessment of current verbal communicative competence in everyday life. competence as a receiver of spoken messages. (1: Never – 7: Always)							
4	I easily understand the main idea of what someone tells me.							
5	I take the context into account to better understand what I hear.							
6	I make sure I understand what I hear before giving my opinion.							
7	In general, I understand well when someone speaks to me.							

	Assessment of current verbal communicative competence as an Education student. competence in academic situations as a student. (1: Never – 7: Always)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	I apply strategies, such as avoiding excessive wording when designing a presentation.							
9	During a presentation, I express myself naturally through gestures and movements.							
10	I speak confidently when I need to participate in class.							
11	I know how to use formal language when speaking in academic situations.							
12	I am prepared to defend a Project before a committee, feeling confident when speaking.							
13	In general, I communicate well in academic situations as a university student.							
	Assessment of current verbal communicative competence when interacting with students (during practicum). (1: Little – 7: A lot)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14	I speak clearly when I am in classes with my students.							
15	I organize well what I explain.							
16	I use examples that children can understand.							
17	I know how to maintain students' attention.							
18	I know how to motivate students to participate.							
19	I feel confident conducting a class without the help of another teacher or classmate.							
20	When explaining something in class, I use gestures and body language to communicate better.							
	Assessment of current verbal communicative competence in other school-related situations. (1: Little – 7: A lot)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	I communicate well (or I could do so) in meetings with parents.							
22	I communicate well (or I could do so) in meetings with other teachers.							
23	I communicate well (or I could do so) with a child during an individual tutoring session.							
	Assessment of the training received during university studies in the degree program. (The courses taken in the degree program have helped you develop) (1: Little – 7: A lot)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	I consider that I know how to listen to spoken messages.							
25	I know how to communicate in a formal academic situation related to the degree program (oral presentations, thesis defenses, meetings with professors, etc)							

26	I know how to communicate orally in an examination setting before a committee or during a job interview.							
27	I believe that the courses I have taken so far in the degree program have helped me develop the oral communication skills required of a teacher.							
	Impact of IA/technology (1: Never – 7: Always)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	I feel more confident when AI helps me organize my speech (e.g., with a script)							
29	I feel more confident when AI helps me with the design of my presentations.							

Appendix B: Interview of Communicative Abilities during the Teaching Practicum

Objective: The interview aims to explore pre-service TEFL teachers' perceptions of the communicative challenges they experienced during their teaching practice, with particular emphasis on fear of performance, the development of communicative skills, the professional roles assumed when interacting with parents, and the institutional support received throughout their university training.

Edad	Semestre		
	Séptimo		Sexto

Communicative Challenges

- 1.1 What communicative challenges did you experience when interacting with university and school mentor teachers and academic staff during your teaching practice?
- 1.2 What communicative difficulties did you face when interacting with parents, school academic staff or caregivers?
2. Which of the communicative challenges previously mentioned did you find most difficult to manage, and why?

Fear of Performance and Communication Anxiety

3. In which situations was fear of performance most evident (for example, being observed, speaking in English, communicating with parents, being evaluated, etc.)?

Professional Roles in Communication with Parents

- 4.1 When communicating with parents, which professional roles did you feel you needed to assume (e.g., educator, advisor, mediator, authority figure, or institutional representative)?
- 4.2 What kind of communication style did you use? Was it effective?
5. What specific communicative skills do you consider necessary to effectively perform these roles when interacting with parents?
 1. Clear and Accessible Language
 - Ability to explain academic, behavioral, or administrative information in simple, non-technical language.
 2. Active Listening
 - Ability to genuinely understand parents' concerns, emotions, and perspectives
 3. Emotional Intelligence & Empathy

- Ability to recognize emotions and respond respectfully and sensitively. 4. Assertive and Respectful Communication
 - Ability to express professional boundaries, expectations, and decisions respectfully.
5. Problem-Solving and Negotiation Skills
- Ability to collaboratively find solutions with parents.

Development and Preparation

6. What communicative skills did you develop or strengthen during your teaching practice that helped you communicate more effectively in academic and school contexts?

Institutional Support

7.1 What type of support did you receive from mentor teachers, university supervisors, or the institution to cope with communicative challenges?

7.2 What type of support did you receive from mentor teachers, university supervisors, or the institution to cope with performance anxiety?

8. What types of support or preparation do you believe were insufficient or missing during your training?