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Resumen
El Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior contempla el desarrollo de la competencia comunicativa como cuestión fundamental en los planes de formación en Magisterio, por lo que es oportuno profundizar en el conocimiento de las percepciones que las y los futuros maestros tienen sobre su competencia oral y sobre la formación recibida en este aspecto en la titulación. En esta línea, se presentan el diseño y validación de un cuestionario con 156 estudiantes de Magisterio. Los resultados avalan la solidez de la herramienta y la exploración de las valoraciones del alumnado muestra la incidencia de variables como el sexo y la experiencia académica o profesional previa. Además, destaca la correlación negativa entre la valoración de la formación recibida y el curso, con una valoración insuficiente entre el alumnado que se encuentra finalizando la titulación.

Palabras clave

Resumo
O Espaço Europeu de Ensino Superior contempla o desenvolvimento da competência comunicativa como uma questão fundamental nos planos de formação de professores. Portanto, faz-se necessário aprofundar o conhecimento das percepções que futuros professores têm sobre sua competência oral e sobre a formação recebida nesse aspecto ao longo do curso. Neste sentido, são apresentados o modelo e a validação de um questionário com 156 professores em formação. Os resultados confirmam a solidez da ferramenta e a exploração das avaliações dos alunos mostra a incidência de algumas variáveis, como sexo, experiência acadêmica ou profissional. Além disso, destaca-se a correlação negativa entre a avaliação da
formação recebida e o curso, com uma avaliação insuficiente entre os alunos que estão concluindo o curso.

**Palavras-chave**

**Design of a questionnaire to assess the competence in oral communication of the Teacher training students**

**Abstract**
The European Higher Education Area considers the development of communicative competence as a fundamental issue in the teacher training plans. Thus, it is appropriate to deepen the knowledge on the perceptions that future teachers have about their oral competence and about the training that they have received in this aspect throughout the teaching training degree. In this line, the design and validation of a questionnaire with 156 teachers of teaching training is presented. The results verify the solidity of the tool. In addition, the exploration of student evaluations shows the incidence of some variables such as sex or previous academic or professional experience. In addition, the negative correlation between the evaluation of the training that they have received, and the course stands out, with an insufficient evaluation among the students who are finishing the degree.
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1 **Introduction**

Since the Bologna Declaration and the consolidation of the European Higher Education Area, a process that took from 1997 to 2010, communication skills have become one of the main competencies included in teacher training degree programmes, as they are essential in professional teaching practice.

Firstly, twenty-first-century epistemological bases of education highlight the importance of communication in acquiring knowledge. Interactionist and social constructivist theories expounded by authors such as Vygotsky (2000) and Bruner (1986, 1991) have emphasised the impact of oral language on learning ability from childhood and its importance in schools. Progress in language teaching and the development of a communication focus have also heightened the need to prioritise oral skills in classrooms, an issue that involves constantly reviewing teacher training programmes, their approach to language teaching and their theoretical grounds.
At the same time, in line with the social learning theory by Bandura (1984), teachers must present themselves as appropriate model speakers, since besides impacting their pupils’ language acquisition, they are also an example for families and other stakeholders. Rosales (2013) differentiates between three groups of specific skills that trainee teachers should acquire: skills to encourage learning, linked to the classroom; skills linked to participation contexts, for example collaboration with staff, families and other institutions in the school environment; and specific curricular skills that involve collaboration between peers and with other professionals. They all require interaction in several contexts and involve a command of oral communication. Consequently, researching the perceptions (MATOS; JARDILINO, 2016) trainee teachers have of their oral skills and the role they attribute to their university training in acquiring them is of interest.

2 State of the art

As a line of research, interest in both a theoretical (BALAGUER; FUENTES; PALAU, 2015) and a practical (OREJUDO; FERNÁNDEZ-TURRADO; BRIZ, 2012; GRÀCIA et al., 2019) approach to studying oral skills in trainee teachers has increased.

Descriptive research studies by Domingo, Gallego, García and Rodríguez (2010), Domingo, Gallego and Rodríguez (2013) and Gallego and Rodríguez (2014, 2015, 2018) reveal that students have a low self-evaluation of their communication skills as teachers, which is in line with the analysis conducted by the teaching staff of the teacher training degree. Their results also show that students in higher courses have a better self-perception and their self-evaluations of their receptive skills are more positive than their self-evaluations of their oral expression skills.

Concerning studies based on participation, the contributions made by Gràcia, Jarque, Astals and Rouaz (2019) and Orejudo, Fernández-Turrado and Briz (2012) highlight the importance of students reflecting on their oral communication strategies. These studies show that explicit reflection is more effective than any implicit work during course subjects, since “nine hours of participation in the communication skills..."
programme manage to improve self-efficacy more than four months attending ordinary classes” (OREJUD; FERNÁNDEZ-TURRADO; BRIZ, 2012, p. 211).

Although interest in this line of research is increasing, as Gràcia, Jarque, Astals and Rouaz (2019) mention, hardly any studies focus on trainee teachers’ oral skills. Similarly, Gallego and Rodríguez (2014) highlight the need for studies to address trainee teachers’ perceptions of their oral communication skills in teaching dimensions.

3 Methodological design of the research

3.1 Study objectives

Within this theoretical framework, the research pursues the following objectives:

1. Designing a questionnaire to study trainee teachers' perception of their oral communication skills and the training they have received in this regard throughout their teacher training studies.

2. Exploring students' perception of the dimensions forming trainee teachers’ oral communication skills, and discovering their main difficulties and their evaluation of the training they have received.

3. Identifying variables associated with better self-perception of trainee teachers’ oral communication skills.

3.2 Methodological approach

The study followed a non-experimental quantitative survey design using a closed-ended questionnaire that included an open-ended question to triangulate or expand the quantitative data. This is a interdisciplnary and exploratory research, since the aim is to “begin to understand a variable or a set of variables, a community, a context, an event, a situation. It is an initial exploration at a specific time.” (HERNÁNDEZ; FERNÁNDEZ; BAPTISTA, 2014, p. 155).
3.3 Context and sample

The research was conducted in the teacher training degree at the University of Zaragoza. The participants were studying this qualification at the Huesca and Zaragoza campuses. The sampling technique was non-probabilistic and convenience. The degree teaching staff were contacted and they made the questionnaire available to their students. Completing the questionnaire was voluntary and anonymous; this resulted in the participation of 156 students (Table 1). The students enrolled on this degree totalled 2,678 at the time at the aforementioned campuses; therefore, based on a confidence level of 95% and an error margin of 5%, a sample of 337 participants was needed to attain representativeness. Therefore, this study can be considered a first exploratory approach to the object of study.

Table 1 – Main characteristics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>Huesca</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>Preschool teacher training</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23-24</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>Primary teacher training</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 35</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own (2020).

3.4 Research tool

The research tool used consisted of a questionnaire with 34 closed-ended 5-point Likert scale items and one open-ended question. The questionnaire aimed to measure the trainee teachers' self-evaluation of their oral communication skills (25 items) and their evaluation of the training they had received in this regard in their teacher training studies (9 items).

It was designed using the questionnaire by Gallego and Rodríguez (2014) as a reference, although it was adapted to the objectives of this research. These authors’ questionnaire has 63 items organised into five dimensions: skill as a good transmitter; skill as a good receiver; communication skills in the classroom; skills to act in meetings with parents or peers; and skills to perform the role of tutor.
Besides oral skills associated with the school context, the aim of this research was to explore the students’ self-perception of their skills as trainee teachers and their evaluation of the training they had received during their degree. The end result was the questionnaire in Annex 1. It is a tool with four parts: sociodemographic data forming the independent variables—sex, campus, degree, course, age, previous studies, employment situation, specialisation, languages spoken, language qualifications—are collated in the first; the second contains the items for every self-exploratory dimension—skill as a transmitter (Items 1–4), skill as a receiver (Items 5–9), skill as a university student (Items 10–16), teaching skill in the classroom (Items 17–22) and skill as a teacher in other school situations (Items 23–25); the third part is for items related to the evaluation of the training received during the teacher training degree (Items 26–34). Finally, the questionnaire is complemented by an open-ended question that allows participants to say anything they deem necessary.

### 3.5 Questionnaire validation

The questionnaire validated by Gallego and Rodríguez (2014), used as a starting point, offered a certain degree of reliability. However, analysis of the validity and reliability of the definitive tool was considered advisable as it had been modified.

The internal consistency of the questionnaire was analysed using Cronbach’s alpha to calculate its reliability. This coefficient expresses the intercorrelation or consistency among the items between 0 and 1. Hernández and Mendoza (2018) deem the value acceptable from .70, although in exploratory research it can be acceptable from .60. The coefficients were high and confirmed the tool’s reliability (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2 – Results of the questionnaire’s reliability analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own (2020).

An internal consistency test, specifically an exploratory factor analysis, was conducted to calculate the validity of the questionnaire. First, a KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-
Olkin) test and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were conducted. Their results (Table 3) enabled the exploratory factor analysis to take place.

Table 3 – Results of the KMO test and Bartlett’s test of sphericity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett’s tests</th>
<th>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy</th>
<th>.875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett’s test of sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-square</td>
<td>1988.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gl</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own (2020).

The factor analysis corroborated the adequacy of the dimensions; however, concerning oral communication skills as students, the items were ordered into two subdimensions that partly corresponded to the items related to the skills students use daily in the classroom and partly to those related to more formal situations. Consequently, these two subdimensions were considered and their reliability calculated with acceptable results (α .645 for the former and α .813 for the latter).

3.6 Data processing

The data were processed using version 15 of the SPSS software. Means comparison tests and correlation analyses were conducted. Before deciding on the statistic to apply, homogeneity of variance was tested using Levene’s test. One-way ANOVA tests or their non-parametric alternative, Brown–Forsythe, were applied to compare the means. Tukey’s and the Games–Howell post hoc tests were also conducted to establish the groups for finding differences, as appropriate.

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Self-evaluation of oral skills

In general, as shown in Graph 1, an acceptable perception (around 3) is observed and even a positive perception (above 4) of oral skills by the students in all the included dimensions.
A more detailed analysis (Graph 2) evidences similar and different trends among the students in the four academic years. Concerning similar trends, it was observed that the students in the four courses concur in favourably evaluating their skills as receivers (Items 5–9), while they perceive more difficulties in their oral skills as students (Items 10–16). One example is the following reply to the questionnaire’s open-ended question: “A2: My main communication problem is that I tend to get nervous and, therefore, I speak very fast, so fast that sometimes people can’t understand me properly. But I don’t realise until someone tells me” (Female, 3rd course, aged 22, works, but not a public-facing job).

However, regarding skills related to teaching practice (Items 17–25), the distance between 1st and 4th course students is obvious, since perceptions are more positive among students in their final course. It is also significant that only 1st-course students evaluate items with an insufficient mean score, specifically items relating to communication in an oral exam situation and to the ability to express oneself in the classroom in front of teachers and peers (Items 12, 14 and 15).

**Graph 1** – General means for each of the questionnaire’s oral communication dimensions

Source: Own (2020).
All the independent variables report significant differences, except the preschool and primary teacher training degrees (Table 4). Firstly, the sex variable seems to impact on the results, since the males demonstrate a better perception of their communication skills as teachers than the females (Levene’s test=1.84, p=.178; F=6.20; p=.014).

Concerning the course, the more substantial differences are found in communication skills in the school classroom as teachers (Levene’s test=1.01, p=.389; F=3.40; p=.020). Tukey’s post hoc test (p=.015) shows that differences are found between the 2nd course (µ 3.80) and the 4th course of the degree (µ 4.21).

The age variable shows a similar trend in the skills as a university student dimension (Levene’s test=1.15, p=.332; F=2.06, p=.037), specifically (p=.050) between students aged 22 (µ 3.11) and those aged from 30 to 35 (µ 4.11). Consequently, older students have a better perception of their communication skills. Furthermore, Pearson’s correlation analysis reports a significant result with a positive, yet weak, correlation between oral communication skills as a student and the age factor—in accordance with the parameters of Hernández and Mendoza (2018)—as they are below .30.

Table 4 – Results of Pearson’s correlation (oral communication as a student in formal situations and age)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Student_Total</th>
<th>VI_Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (bilateral)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: The correlation is significant at level 0.05 (2-tailed).

Source: Own (2020).
There are also differences in the specialisation the participants are studying or thinking about studying. Consequently, the mean self-evaluation (Levene’s test=1.78, p=.184; F=4.50, p=.036) is higher for those choosing to specialise in languages—English, French, Aragonese or bilingual education—(µ 3.97) compared with the other specialisations (µ 3.76). Having another qualification (Levene’s test=2.56, p=.081; F=6.88, p=.001) is also an incidence variable; a student with a previous university degree (µ 3.89) has a better perception of their oral skills in formal situations in a university setting (p=.002) than those that do not have one (µ 3.14). Finally, the employment situation also seems to influence their self-evaluation of their skills as students, especially in more formal situations (Levene’s test=1.28, p=.387; F=5.35, p=.006). Specifically, Tukey’s post hoc test (p=.004) shows that these differences are found between those who have a public-facing job (µ 3.50) and those who do not work (µ 3.06). In line with this, several respondents mentioned in the questionnaire’s open-ended question that they have developed their oral skills more in their job and in their everyday experiences, which complement their training as teachers, than in the teacher training classrooms.

A4: I believe that I acquired the best oral skills I have through experience rather than in the teacher training classrooms, at work and at the leisure centre where I participate. (Female, 3rd course, aged 20, public-facing job).

A22: I acquired my communication skills by dealing with situations in my everyday life and not with courses or teacher’s explanations. I think that experience exposes you to the context and everyone has to find their own tools to improve. (Female, 2nd course, aged 30–35, does not work).

Despite the aforementioned results, the study is only exploratory and its effect size obtains modest results, except in the age variable, where $\eta^2$.132 appears for the dimension related to oral skills as a student in formal situations and $\eta^2$.120 for general situations.
4.2 Evaluation of the training received in oral skills

Concerning students’ evaluation of the training received in oral skills during the teacher training degree, the mean general score is extremely limited (µ 3.16), since the minimum score possible was one point. In the questionnaire’s open-ended question, several students highlight the need to include more oral skill training and communication practice in teacher training degree subjects:

A14: I think the training given during the course for the communication skills required in the teaching profession is very insufficient, not so much for academic purposes (oral presentations in the classroom, etc.) but for teaching purposes (giving lessons, preparing tutorials, speaking with families, etc.). We are not trained in the latter and I think it’s a fundamental aspect of our future profession. (Female, 4th course, aged 25–30, public-facing job).

A3: I think the course should have a public-speaking subject; I don’t just mean that subjects already offered should develop oral discourse more (although they should as well), but that there should be a subject for it, since the voice and communication skills are a teacher’s main tools. Looking after your voice and how to express yourself in front of an audience are never worked on. This isn’t understandable given that it’s our best ally when we’re teaching. (Female, 3rd course, aged 22, works, but not a public-facing job).

Differences have been found for two of the variables examined: sex and course. Consequently, the females’ perception (µ 3.07) is significantly more negative (Levene’s test=.131, p=.718; F=7.36, p=.007) than the males’ (µ 3.57), and there is also a more negative perception (Levene’s test=6.10, p=.001; F=2.96, p=.036) between students that are finishing their degree (in the 4th course) (µ 2.91) compared with those that are
starting it (in the 1st course) (μ 3.56). Applying Pearson’s correlation test gives a
significant result (p=.015) and a negative, yet weak, correlation (r=-.199).

![Graph 3 – Mean of the skills items on training received by course](image)

Source: Own (2020).

Finally, the results are significant in several correlation analyses. Pearson’s test
shows a positive correlation and mean strength between the perception of skills as a
transmitter and the evaluation of the teacher training received (r=.318; p=.000). Students
who consider themselves more skilled in oral expression evaluate the oral communication
training received more highly, as this respondent explains:

A12: The problem is that we need TEACHERS that have worked as primary
school teachers. They are the only ones who can help us develop skills as they
are the ones that know what it’s like in the classroom and they are better trained.
I’m worried about finishing my degree and not being skilled enough in this
aspect. I don’t want to be a mediocre teacher. (Female, 2nd course, aged 20,
works, but not a public-facing job).

The same happens with the perception of the skills needed as a student in formal
situations (r=.298; p=.000). Consequently, those that self-evaluate themselves higher in
these situations also evaluate the training received more highly. The following response
exemplifies a respondent’s positive self-evaluation in oral communication linked to a
positive evaluation of the training received in one of the degree subjects: “A20: This
subject [Didactics of the Spanish Language] is the only one that has given me pointers for
making presentations at the university” (Male, 3rd course, aged 25, public-facing job).

The perception of oral skills as a student (r=.369; p=.000), as a teacher in
the classroom (r=.216; p.009) and other teaching relationships (r=.317; p.000) present the
same correlation, as occurs when considering the general score of the oral communication items (r=.378; p.000).

Table 6 – Pearson’s correlation (self-evaluation of general oral communication and evaluation of the training received)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Communication_TOTAL</th>
<th>Training_TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.378**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (bilateral)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. The correlation is significant at level 0.01 (2-tailed).

Source: Own (2020).

5 Final considerations

The main aim of this research was to design a reliable questionnaire to study trainee teachers’ perceptions of their oral skills and the training received in this regard during their degree. The results confirm the consistency of the questionnaire created from the tool devised by Gallego and Rodríguez (2014). Consequently, the tool is included in this article’s annex, as it may prove useful in similar research.

Concerning the study of students’ perception of their oral communication skills, the exploratory analysis uncovers a lower self-evaluation of their skills as a transmitter than as a receiver. Oral expression is also perceived as especially limited in more formal communication situations. The analysis also suggests the impact of some variables—mainly sex, age, course and previous academic or professional experience—as the best self-evaluations were made by males, older people or those in higher courses, those with a previous university degree and those who combine their studies with a public-facing job.

Regarding the evaluation of the training received in their university studies, attitudes are more critical among the females. A negative correlation is also detected between this critical attitude and the course, to the extent that the 4th course students consider the training in oral skills received during the degree to be insufficient. However, these results contrast with teacher training study plans, which promote the development of communication skills, even though it is only implicit and interdisciplinary in oral and
written presentation tasks. Based on the students’ perception, the results show that this approach does not suffice and, therefore, explicit oral communication planning is necessary. Consequently, there should be activities encouraging students to think explicitly about their oral communication strategies in subjects where this skill is developed in an implicit and interdisciplinary manner, as recommended by Del Moral (2017). Furthermore, given how important this skill is in teacher development, and based on the results of prior research, such as studies by Orejudo, Fernández-Turrado and Briz (2010), Romero, Gaminde, Etxebarría and Garay (2013) and Senís and Del Moral (2017), study plans in the context of this research should include a specific subject on communication skills for teachers. This subject should explicitly address how students acquire oral skills, supported by the necessary link between theory and practice that teacher training requires (MEZZAROBA and CARRIQUIRBORDE, 2020). This training could prove useful for their professional development, as the results of the study by Romero, Gaminde, Etxebarría and Garay (2013) show, based on an experience in preschool and primary education degrees at the University of Zaragoza. We see this proposal as a contribution to improving initial teacher training, thus continuing the Spanish tradition of over two centuries of educating educators (SÁNCHEZ; SÁNCHEZ, 2019).

Finally, as mentioned above, the results in this article are exploratory and should be interpreted with caution. Therefore, our work aims to open some future lines of research, such as replicating the study with a representative sample complemented by a qualitative study. The objective would be to further explore the variables and pointers highlighted as the most significant in this research. Along the same lines as Gallego and Rodríguez (2018), we believe the perceptions of the teacher training degree teaching staff should be explored and the results compared with their students’ evaluations to provide a more comprehensive picture of the object of study and the impact of this first study’s proposal on students and their teachers.
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**Annex 1 – Questionnaire on trainee teachers’ perception of their oral communication skills and of their university training in this regard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Huesca</td>
<td>Zaragoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Have you studied another qualification?  
  - Yes, another degree  
  - Yes, vocational training  
  - No

- If you’re studying and working, is your job public-facing?  
  - I don’t work  
  - Yes, it’s public-facing  
  - No

- In which languages are you bilingual?  
  - In which languages do you have a qualification?

---


---

*Este trabajo ha sido licenciado en la licencia Creative Commons Atribución 4.0 Internacional.*
### Evaluation of my oral communication skills in my everyday life.

#### Skill as a transmitter of oral messages. (1: Never – 5: Always)

1. I express myself orally properly and correctly using appropriate words for every communication situation.
2. I feel confident when I have to start an oral communication situation.
3. I coherently and cohesively articulate the ideas I want to express and I support them with examples.
4. In general, I consider that my command of communication skills as a transmitter is good.

### Evaluation of my oral communication skills as a trainee teacher.

#### Skill in academic situations as a student.

1. When giving an oral presentation, I correctly organise information in the PPT (using a variety of fonts and not using too many letters, etc.) and always think about how it will help the recipient understand or supplement my oral discourse.
2. When giving an oral presentation, I support my communication with PPT, linking the discourse together without reading, and I make it more dynamic by using gestures, movements, etc. appropriately and naturally.
3. In the classroom (as a student), I express myself naturally without any inhibitions in front of the group and teacher when the situation requires me to do this (to give an opinion, answer/ask questions, etc.).
4. I feel able to use an academic register in a formal oral communication situation.
5. While defending my work orally to a panel of examiners, I interacted confidently with the panel. (If you have not yet experienced this situation, indicate the extent to which you believe you are prepared to deal with it successfully).
6. While defending my work orally to a panel of examiners, I answered the panel’s questions and backed up my arguments. (If you have not yet experienced this situation, indicate the extent to which you believe you are prepared to deal with it successfully).
7. In general, I consider that my command of academic communication skills as a university student is good.

### Evaluation of my oral communication skills with pupils.

#### (If you have not had any teaching practice, think about how prepared you are). (1: Not much – 5: A lot)

1. In the classroom with my pupils, I articulate clearly and correctly at a moderate speed and with an appropriate tone of voice.
2. When I give children classes, I organise my explanations appropriately and I use suitable examples for the content I teach and the pupils’ level of understanding.
3. I can gain and keep the pupils’ attention and encourage them to participate.
4. I feel confident leading the class group without any help from or supervision by another teacher.
When I am explaining something to my pupils, I use gestures and other bodily expressions to aid communication.

In general, I consider that my command of classroom teaching communication aspects is good.

**Evaluation of my oral communication skills in other school situations.** (If you have not had any teaching practice, think about how prepared you are). *(1: Not much – 5: A lot)*

In general, I consider that my command of communication skills with families in tutorials is/would be good.

In general, I consider that my current command of communication skills in meetings with other teachers (e.g. staff meetings) is/would be good.

In general, I consider that my current command of communication skills with a child in an individual tutorial is/would be good.

**Evaluation of the training received in the university teacher training course.** *(The subjects studied during the course have helped you to develop …)* *(1: Not much – 5: A lot)*

Skills to be a good transmitter of oral messages.

Skills to be a good receiver of oral messages.

Skills to communicate orally in a formal academic situation during the course (oral presentations, defence of work, meetings with teachers, etc.).

Skills to communicate orally as a teacher in a school classroom.

Skills to communicate orally as a teacher in tutorial meetings with families.

Skills to communicate orally as a teacher in staff meetings.

Skills to communicate orally as a teacher in an individual tutorial with a pupil.

Skills to communicate orally in an exam situation in front of a board of examiners.

In general, I believe the subjects I have studied so far on my course have helped me develop the oral communication skills a teacher needs.

**Add any comment you believe is relevant to the questionnaire’s purpose:**
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