

TEACHER IDENTITY, SELF-REPORTED PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, AND PERCEIVED TEACHING READINESS AMONG EFL PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

Dinovia Fannil Kher¹, Anisa Nurjanah², Nur Rosita³

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, dinovia.rezi@fbs.unp.ac.id

² Universitas Negeri Padang, anisanurjanah@fbs.unp.ac.id

³ University of Liverpool, n.rosita@liverpool.ac.uk

©2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License-(CC-BY-SA) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

 DOI : <https://doi.org/10.30983/mj.v4i2.11196>

<i>Submission: February 18, 2026</i>	<i>Revised: May 30, 2026</i>	<i>Published: June 30, 2026</i>
--------------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------------

Abstract

Preparing EFL pre-service teachers involves pedagogical preparation and an understanding of professional responsibilities. This exploratory cross-sectional survey examined the relationships of teacher identity and self-reported pedagogical knowledge with perceived teaching readiness among English Education students at Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia. Seventeen students were purposively selected based on their participation in, or completion of, a teaching practicum. The study used three ten-item questionnaire scales and analyzed the data using descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, Pearson correlations, and multiple linear regression. Teacher identity was positively associated with perceived readiness ($r = 0.714$, $p = 0.001$), as was self-reported pedagogical knowledge ($r = 0.746$, $p < .001$). The joint model accounted for 80.6% of readiness-score variance within the sample ($R^2 = 0.806$; adjusted $R^2 = 0.778$; $F(2,14) = 29.108$, $p < 0.001$). Both predictors retained positive coefficients after accounting for the other predictor. Descriptive item patterns indicated higher self-ratings for lesson planning than for addressing learning difficulties, and higher confidence in teaching before students than in responding to varied classroom situations. The findings suggest that teacher education should address professional identification and perceived pedagogical preparation jointly. Interpretation remains limited by the small sample, self-report measures, limited validity evidence, and cross-sectional design. Practical implications include professional reflection, pedagogical decision-making activities, and practicum mentoring.

Keywords: EFL pre-service teachers, teacher identity, self-reported pedagogical knowledge, perceived teaching readiness, teaching practicum.

1. Introduction

English language teacher education students are prepared for tasks that go beyond explaining language form or choosing classroom activities (Kohnke & Zou, 2025). Pre-service teachers must analyze student reactions, manage participation, monitor comprehension, and decide when to adjust the lesson's direction. They must also consider how their sense of responsibility for students' learning shapes their view of their professional roles (Latva-aho et al., 2024). These issues are likely to come to the fore during the teaching practice component of their program, where students will need to balance school-based and university-based expectations. Examining their perceptions of preparedness may answer questions that coursework and teaching practice supervision need to address, provided that perceived preparedness can be distinguished from demonstrated teaching proficiency.

In this context, readiness for teaching is defined as participants' ratings of their perceived readiness to perform the duties of a teacher. This refers to perceptions of readiness to teach, manage the classroom, make instructional decisions, and handle various classroom situations

(Pradev et al., 2023). The item at the core of perceived readiness is important because the data are derived from questionnaire responses rather than an observed external rating of activity. For example, a student might rate high on perceived readiness to teach a class but low on how well he can interpret a classroom mistake, while another person might make an appropriate instructional decision but report high uncertainty. Readiness scores can be understood as being self-report data rather than a reflection of good teaching practice in multiple contexts (Utegulov et al., 2026).

Others have found it necessary to consider readiness in the context of a task. Tutyandari (2022), who interviewed and used questionnaires with Indonesian pre-service English teachers, found evidence of variation by teaching task and that a single global judgment did not capture a number of concerns. Manasia et al. (2020) conceptualized this concept in the context of education for sustainable development, in terms of professional knowledge, practice, engagement, and self-management. This latter concept is based on another educational context and is not adopted here. These studies highlight the value of clarifying what 'being ready' entails and what it might encompass in practice, rather than assuming it is consistent across studies.

Perceived readiness is related, but should not be conflated with, teacher self-efficacy. Self-efficacy literature tends to focus on self-belief for particular actions, whereas this readiness scale reflects broader judgments about the expectation of assuming a role. Ma and Cavanagh (2018) found classroom management to be one of the greatest concerns that pre-service teachers expected to encounter in their first professional placement, suggesting that concern with sources of uncertainty is valuable but that does not make a self-efficacy instrument comparable to this questionnaire. Clarity of definition and boundaries is important when confidence is expressed in indicators of readiness and when a self-report questionnaire measures multiple constructs.

It is an important professional perspective from which such judgments can be viewed. For example, Pennington and Richards (2016) explore language teacher identity through personal, contextual, and professional dimensions. This view implies that teacher identification involves seeing oneself in relation to students, colleagues, the institution, and one's professional duties. For pre-service teachers, this identification is expected to sit alongside their roles as students, informed by external observation and commentary, without fully incorporating the role of an autonomous classroom professional. As a result, identity becomes about a professional Self, not just words and actions that express confidence and competence.

Reflections and positions help to elaborate this understanding. Arvaja (2016) examined identity work through reflective learning diaries and showed how studying the self's interactions with important others can clarify a professionally oriented position. Although this study does not use the narrative evidence or the reconstruction of identity negotiations employed in this article, this perspective should provide a conceptual framework for incorporating professional self-perception, task awareness, and reflection into the operational definition of identity. Furthermore, commitment seems relevant, assuming teaching is a worthwhile profession rather than an ephemeral pleasure. These content areas define the questionnaire's scope without being an empirically tested multidimensional model of identity.

Practicum studies also imply the need for identity analysis that considers context. Zhao and Zhang (2017) combined pre- and post-teaching-practice questionnaires with qualitative data and found changes in some identity areas, as well as the importance of mentoring support for participants. Their method also makes changes more attributable than a one-time survey. In this research, although the practicum relates to a participant group, we cannot assume the practicum caused any change in certain identity scores. The role of the practicum in each participant's identity

score therefore is uncertain, and care must be taken when analyzing the relationship between identity and readiness.

The items were selected to explore pedagogical knowledge, the knowledge needed to organize and facilitate learning. It is crucial to distinguish pedagogical knowledge from English language knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge. Pedagogical content knowledge was typified by Shulman (1986) in terms of presenting specific content and understanding the problems that students encounter in that specific content. The present instrument includes a broader range of pedagogical issues, such as lesson planning, selecting teaching techniques, catering to individual learners' needs, media, and assessment. These are all relevant to EFL teaching, as lessons inevitably require teachers to decide whether activities fit the lesson's goals and learner participation, and how to measure them (Lakew et al., 2025). English language proficiency alone is unlikely to answer these queries.

König et al. (2020) distinguished between declarative pedagogical knowledge, the adaptability of written lesson plans, and self-reports on instructional practice. Their results indicated a link between tested knowledge and adaptation in planning context-specific situations, highlighting the need to distinguish teachers' knowledge from how they use it. Participants rated their pedagogical preparation. Therefore, self-reported pedagogical knowledge is a construct-validated label, with scores based on respondents' subjective opinions about their pedagogical preparation; however, the rating values do not reveal the accuracy, domain range, or cost of teachers' knowledge in addressing problems of practice.

This differs from Blömeke et al.'s (2015) understanding of competence as existing on a continuum that comprises meta-cognitive predispositions, perception and decision making specific to the circumstance, and performance. This involves the avoidance of limiting evidence to a particular Type of measure for the processes of all five levels of professionalism. The questionnaires are self-report measures, and classroom interpretation and performance are not incorporated into the empirical analysis. The continuum offers a way to interpret the results rather than confirm a linear regression-based model of the process. Thus, the endeavor is to determine how participants' self-evaluation, professionally and pedagogically, may relate to their preparedness assessment, rather than to prove a complete process from knowledge to successful teaching.

Existing Indonesian empirical literature can inform the refinement of the research question: Cania et al. (2024) investigated practicum-related self-efficacy for student engagement, instructional strategies, and classroom management, pointing to differences between them. Anandari et al. (2025) examined classroom management and concern for learners through daily structured reflections from 23 EFL pre-service teachers. Farmasari et al. (2026) investigated issues of identity, coursework, and readiness in an English for young learners program. Concerns about readiness and professional identity are therefore not new to the field, and the constructs and methods used in these studies suggest that the proposed research needs to clearly delineate its contribution.

Internationally, there is some indication that caution should be exercised in making broad generalizations between professional variables and preparedness. Specifically, Huang et al. (2023), in a study exploring motivation, constructivist beliefs, conscientiousness, and preparedness of pre-service teachers in China, conclude that relationships between variables should be specific to the variables and conditions under consideration. However, in this context, constructivist beliefs were unable to account for the motivation-preparedness link. Such conclusions highlight the importance of clearly articulating the relationship being explored and discourage using theories of untested psychological mechanisms. Although, as noted elsewhere, related concepts such as identity,

motivation, self-efficacy, and pedagogical knowledge could be discussed in tandem, they are not interchangeable.

This study asked an analytical question not directly investigated in the literature. Descriptive profiles suggested readiness states, and individual correlations tested whether two variables co-varied. Neither analysis on its own showed what was asked in the study question--whether teacher identity co-varied with readiness when identity variance was controlled and whether pedagogical self-appraisal remained when all identity variance was controlled. A joint model showed conditional relationships among English Education students completing a practicum. The model aimed to test whether a pattern existed in a specific population and revealed that identity and readiness have not been researched together and that one institution cannot be said to provide a better setting than another.

The conceptual model describes three specific inquiries. Identity addresses how participants think about their identity as a teacher; Pedagogical Knowledge measures how well they know training techniques; and Readiness allows them to self-assess their status as a teacher. The identified identities and knowledge serve as correlates and statistical predictors, not as additive predictor sets of the learning experience. It is not used in this way in the conceptual model. The conceptual model does not test for the mediating or moderating role of any potential interaction of the three predictors. This reflects the goal of aligning the desired theoretical explanation with the statistical procedures used while reducing the risk of misinterpreting an association as a developmental or causal effect.

The study aimed to address three research questions: 1) What descriptively characterizes teacher identity, pedagogical knowledge self-report, and perceived readiness to teach? 2) How are teacher identity and pedagogical knowledge self-report related to perceived readiness? 3) Is each predictor related to readiness when both are combined in the same regression model? These questions are expected to yield exploratory evidence for theoretical discussion of professional preparation and to uncover concerns that warrant investigation with more reliable measures and larger samples.

2. Method

The study used an exploratory, cross-sectional correlational survey in the English Education Study Program at Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia. The study examined correlations among the three questionnaires administered simultaneously. The study used teacher identity and self-reported pedagogical knowledge as statistical predictors of perceived teaching readiness. The predictors in the fitted regression model do not clearly predict future teaching performance. The study is not an intervention, repeated measurement, or temporal separation of these constructs.

Purposive sampling identified pre-service teachers of English Education who were either currently doing their practice or had already finished it. This inclusion was deemed relevant because participants had school practice experience to support an appropriate self-assessment. The study included a purposive group of seventeen students, thirteen of whom were practitioners. The other fourteen were still practicing. Thirteen of these participants were in the eighth semester, three in the sixth semester, and one in another semester. This group is a bounded exploratory sample, but the study does not claim to establish its representativeness of the program population, other institutions, or Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers.

The researcher's questionnaire included three subscales, each with ten items. The number of items was thus thirty. The conceptual sources explained what the content covered but did not state

that the instrument was derived from those publications. Likewise, the listed concepts show item coverage rather than constructs confirmed by psychometric testing. The authors should explain why conceptual coherence, internal reliability, and construct validity answer different questions.

Table 1. Operational coverage of the questionnaire

Construct	Operational content areas	Conceptual alignment	Items and codes
Teacher identity	Professional self-perception, commitment, understanding teacher roles, and professional reflection	Professional identification, positioning, and commitment: Pennington and Richards (2016), Arvaja (2016), and Zhao and Zhang (2017)	10; TI1–TI10
Self-reported pedagogical knowledge	Lesson planning, instructional strategies, learner needs, media selection, and assessment	Pedagogical structuring, adaptivity, and assessment: König et al. (2020)	10; PK1–PK10
Perceived teaching readiness	Preparedness for instruction, classroom management, instructional decisions, confidence, and classroom dynamics	Task-specific perceived preparedness: Tutyandari (2022)	10; TR1–TR10

The questionnaire used a self-report format to evaluate perceptions of professional identification and pedagogical preparation. A self-report measure of perceived readiness is especially appropriate, though this limitation is more relevant to knowledge scores. Knowledge scores are therefore treated as pedagogical self-assessments and not test scores. Readiness scores are not intended to stand in for direct observation of teaching performance. This qualification in measurement applies to all the scales in the same way and does not imply that a new instrument has been developed.

Composite scores were calculated as the average of the ten items on each scale and were not transformed into statistically standardized scores to retain the response format. We examined item responses to verify they all had data and were not missing. This article used Cronbach's alpha to assess internal consistency, but these statistics do not indicate whether any scale measures a unidimensional latent trait, how well its content reflects the construct, or whether the three scales are sufficiently independent. In addition, no labels were assigned (e.g., low, moderate, high) because such categorization requires the existence of empirically derived response anchors and defensible boundaries.

Descriptive statistics were used for participant descriptions, composite means and standard deviations, and the most- and least-responded-to items for each scale. The most- and least-responded-to items were compared to suggest relative response patterns, but they were not used as statistical comparisons. Pearson correlations were used for simple bivariate relationships and multiple linear regression for the two predictors together.

The regression table displayed the unstandardized coefficients, standard errors, standardized coefficients, t-statistics, p-values, R, adjusted R, and the F-test. Because the unstandardized coefficients reflect expected differences in the readiness score, conditional on the other predictor, they should not be confused with predictor importance, but rather with a conditional difference in the readiness score. The standardized coefficients express the fitted relations in standard deviation units and were not read as a literal indication of numerical superiority, but rather as the order of predictor importance in the data set, and no statistical tests were run for predictor comparisons.

The collinearity calculation addressed only the relationship between the two predictor variables. It does not test residual normality, outcome linearity, homoscedasticity, independence of errors, or influential data points. The only properties that can be established from the reported

correlations and coefficients tables are those that were used in the supplementary calculations. We used these calculations only to examine the properties they can evaluate, preserving the model's exploratory stance and avoiding misleading the added-precision estimates as a full diagnostic assessment.

The study was guided by voluntary participation, confidentiality, and the use of responses for academic purposes. The reported findings describe aggregate patterns rather than identifiable individual profiles.

3. Results

3.1. Participant characteristics

Table 2 summarizes the composition of the sample. Most respondents were eighth-semester students who had finished the teaching practicum. This suggests the study's results largely reflect students with practicum experience, since most in the sample had finished theirs. Nevertheless, three respondents were still completing their practicum, and the sample is unlikely to allow a meaningful comparison between these two groups by practicum status. Their responses provide background for interpreting the study's overall results.

Table 2. Participant characteristics

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Semester	Sixth	3	17.6
	Eighth	13	76.5
	Other	1	5.9
Teaching practicum	Ongoing	3	17.6
	Completed	14	82.4

3.2. Internal consistency and composite scores

Cronbach's alpha, as shown in Table 3, ranged from 0.830 to 0.944, indicating that the ten items comprising each scale were internally consistent for participants in this study. The estimates of reliability and internal consistency were not, and should not be considered, valid measures of instrument validity, nor did they speak to the ability of the scales to measure separate constructs. The mean score for teacher identity was 3.71, for self-reported pedagogical knowledge was 3.82, and for perceived readiness was 3.84. Teacher identity showed the greatest variation, while pedagogical self-appraisal showed the least.

Table 3. Internal consistency and descriptive statistics

Scale	Items	n	Cronbach's α	M	SD
Teacher identity	10	17	0.944	3.71	0.88
Self-reported pedagogical knowledge	10	17	0.830	3.82	0.44
Perceived teaching readiness	10	17	0.905	3.84	0.64

The means, including the "high" values, should not be taken as indicating the relative strength of the constructs. The scales use a common averaging system, but they cover different content domains, and no statistical test compares the means. For comparison, the evidence given in the opposite direction is simply descriptive of placement and variability, and says nothing about participants having high, say, actual knowledge, readiness, or identity.

3.3. Item-level response patterns

Table 4 specifies the item content of the highest and lowest scored items within each scale. The summative descriptions are summaries of the reported content, and do not constitute the actual wording of the validated questionnaire. Comparing responses for identities suggests that, when considering teaching as part of the self, respondents place greater importance on emotion than on self-concept. Pedagogical responses suggest that respondents value lesson planning more than responding to learners' problems. Readiness responses show a preference for confidence in teaching before the student than responding to the situation, for example, a variety of classroom conditions.

Table 4. Selected item-level patterns

Scale	Highest-scoring content	M	Lowest-scoring content	M
Teacher identity	Emotional involvement in teaching	4.00	Identifying teaching as part of oneself	3.41
Self-reported pedagogical knowledge	Designing a clear lesson plan	4.06	Addressing learners' difficulties	3.24
Perceived readiness	Confidence in teaching before students	4.24	Readiness for varied classroom situations	3.59

The item differences do not imply that the same pattern occurred for everyone. A mean can characterize responses that differ among persons; however, these items are not necessarily characteristic of the full spread of answers. Their educational value may be identifying areas of concern that warrant further investigation. They do not establish statistically significant item differences or indicate change or observable strengths and weaknesses. This distinction is crucial in moving from a numeric profile to preparation advice for teachers.

3.4. Correlations among constructs

Both teacher identity and self-reported pedagogical knowledge were related positively to perceptions of readiness. Table 5 shows rough confidence intervals based on the reported correlations. These confidence intervals show uncertainty that significance levels do not convey: the confidence interval for identity-readiness ranges from 0.355 to 0.889, while the confidence interval for pedagogical knowledge-readiness ranges from 0.414 to 0.903. The point estimates are positive, but the possible sizes of these correlations are probably quite wide.

Table 5. Correlations and approximate 95% confidence intervals

Association	r	p as originally reported	Approximate 95% CI
Teacher identity–readiness	0.714	.001	[.355, .889]
Pedagogical knowledge–readiness	0.746	< .001	[.414, .903]
Teacher identity–pedagogical knowledge	0.323	> .05	[–.187, .696]

The correlation between the predictors was comparatively smaller and not statistically significant. The zero, along with the positive range of values within the Confidence Interval, indicates that the finding does not support their independence. However, the point estimate for pedagogical knowledge-readiness is larger, but it does not definitively show a significantly larger correlation than identity-readiness. No tests of the equality of the dependent correlations were performed. The findings suggest associations within the sample but do not clearly rank their magnitudes.

3.5. *Joint regression model*

The multiple regression yielded $R = 0.898$, $R^2 = 0.806$, and adjusted $R^2 = 0.778$, with $F(2,14) = 29.108$, $p < 0.001$. The fitted model accounted for 80.6% of observed readiness-score variance within the sample. Adjusted R^2 accounts for the number of fitted predictors but does not provide independent validation. Both coefficients remained positive after accounting for the other predictor. Table 6 presents the reported estimates and supplementary intervals.

Table 6. Regression coefficients for perceived teaching readiness

Predictor	B	SE	β	t	p	Approximate 95% CI for B
Constant	-0.809	0.671	—	-1.205	.248	[-2.248, 0.630]
Teacher identity	0.385	0.091	.529	4.251	.001	[0.190, 0.580]
Self-reported pedagogical knowledge	0.841	0.182	.575	4.626	< .001	[0.451, 1.231]

When controlling for pedagogical knowledge, a one-point change in identity is associated with a predicted 0.385 change in the outcome score. Holding identity constant, a one-point change in pedagogical knowledge is predicted to correspond to a 0.841-point difference. These are only score relationships, not cause-and-effect. The interpretation of the intercept will need to be cautious until it can be determined whether zero on the original scales is meaningful. Also, the slightly larger standardized coefficient for pedagogical may not be enough to determine that pedagogical is a more important predictor.

With the predictor correlation of 0.323, the reconstructed tolerance was approximately 0.896, and the VIF was approximately 1.116 for each predictor. These figures argue that a substantial amount of variance inflation does not likely result from predictor collinearity for the findings of the two-variable model reported above. These figures do not, however, show discriminant validity or demonstrate that the outcome relationships meet all of the assumptions of regression. Further, the model estimates and additional computations seem to support an exploratory interpretation, but the need for observation-level diagnostic data remains clear.

4. Discussion

4.1. *Professional identification and perceived readiness*

The link between identity and preparedness indicates that professional identity deserves consideration alongside any preparation to teach. For example, some have suggested that identity with the teaching profession may help people meet expectations surrounding responsibility, engagement, and professional behavior. This does not mean identity is always a stable personal resource that leads to preparedness. Additionally, mirroring Pennington and Richards' (2016) contextual perspective, in particular the student teacher's professional self-understanding probably depends on how much of these roles and recognition are available to the individual in a certain placement. The current association states the connection between the two types of appraisals but does not specify what experience has fostered the link.

The pattern seen for the identity item provides a useful contrast. The information suggests that emotional engagement had a higher mean than identifying teaching as an essential component of their self. It is possible that enjoyment of teaching does not necessarily imply clarity of long-term professional identity. This is useful in advising, as it would be false to assume that enthusiasm during a placement ultimately predicts a career choice, or that a low self-rating need implies the individual has no potential in the profession. This may be elucidated through reflective discussion

on what such judgments mean to respondents (though this information was not gathered in the present study). Arvaja (2016) used a narrative approach to examine these potential meanings further.

We should consider the results in terms of the limitations of a one-off study. Zhao and Zhang (2017) examined identity pre- and post-practice, whereas this one-off study included participants at different points in their practicum, which may address different issues. Our longitudinal data suggest some interest in identity development but do not necessarily mean participants experienced the same changes. Our contribution is a concurrent association, which invites further investigation into shared experiences of professional identity and preparedness.

4.2. Pedagogical self-appraisal and adaptive demands

Thus, the positive correlations between pedagogical knowledge and preparedness could imply that pedagogical preparedness contributes to feeling capable of meeting classroom demands. The factor pattern highlights the behavioral significance of preparation. While one might prepare during scheduled planning time, when a teacher can access resources, consider goals, and prepare the classroom, one might respond to an unexpected learner challenge during an interaction, when they must interpret evidence and decide how to respond. Such surmises seem plausible, but because participants did not perform either task, the results suggest a potential need for support rather than a demonstrated lack of adaptive competence.

Blömeke et al. (2015) offer guidelines for differentiating resources for teaching, situation judgment, and behavior, and they align these elements as interdependent without overemphasizing any one. Also, drawing on findings from König et al. (2020), the three types of knowledge were differentiated based on criterion-validated knowledge, planability in adaptation, and actual practice reports. The data may not map a conclusive relation between self-depictions and these forms of competence; however, they offer insight into participant rating variations in relation to pedagogical AP proportion. Further investigation is needed to link self-judgment to pedagogical aims and effectiveness.

Indonesian studies provide some yardsticks at the level of instructional concerns. Anandari et al. (2025) show that concerns include uncertainty about managing learners and increased classroom responsibility. Cania et al. (2024) show that self-efficacy ratings varied by instructional domain. This pattern yields a similar implication: preparedness should be discussed in terms of specific demands rather than a single global judgment. However, they use different measurement instruments and operational definitions, so they cannot be directly compared as if their yardsticks measured the same attribute and thus cannot be taken as evidence of the same psychological process.

Similarly, the EFL context of study demands specific judgments. Students in the EFL profession are being prepared to teach English, yet their responses to the questionnaire items do not pertain to a particular subject domain, such as teaching English as a foreign language (Hu & Xu, 2024). The data are not evidence of preparedness to meet some linguistic teaching goal (such as producing an explanation of grammatical differences, supporting practice of oral interaction in the classroom, and making a decision about an explanatory claim to evidence of listening comprehension). These instances are offered as suggestions of activities to be evaluated in future research. Differentiation between membership of a context and measurement of its particular subject validates the inference that this is a study of pedagogical self-evaluation by pre-service foreign-language teachers, not a comprehensive measure of language teaching ability. Future

research might test whether similar relationships hold when preparedness is evaluated using more explicitly language-specific factors.

4.3. *Interpreting the joint model*

The joint model uses information over and above that obtained from the two separate readiness correlations. Both predictors remained positively related when used together, indicating that professional identification and the pedagogic self-survey capture readiness-related information in this sample. This pattern aligns with the assumption that professional preparation comprises two perspectives; however, from a psychometric perspective, it does not prove that the questionnaires can distinguish these perspectives. The empirical relationship between scores and the validity of inferences made from those scores are separate issues, particularly when writing content appears on both the knowledge and the readiness scales.

The size of R^2 is worth reflection. A model that fits a small sample well can produce estimates that are sensitive to particular data points and choices of measures. Therefore, the proportion of variance explained at this time should not be considered an achievable standard for comparison with other programs, nor should it be viewed as an indicator that, in most applications, readiness is likely to be explained by these two variables. The reconstructed VIF implies limited collinearity among predictors, but shared self-report biases and correlation with outcome are both likely contributing to some model fit.

Additionally, the findings allow a more delicate comparison with the previous research. While Farmasari et al. (2026) examined identity and preparedness in relation to EYL coursework, the present analysis supported the conditional nature of score relationships among practicum-experienced English Education students. However, although Huang et al. (2023) examined a different set of psychological variables and found that relationships with preparedness varied across the models studied, these comparisons further support pursuing explicitly specified relationships rather than expecting a common path of preparation. While the model here offers a question for replication, it does not explain how classroom competence develops from professional identity and pedagogical preparation.

4.4. *Implications for curriculum and practicum support*

The real-world applications relate to support structuring, not readiness designation. A program could 'open up' reflection on readiness via self-assessments and then ask for evidence from lesson plans, classroom events, or comments. This approach would let learners explain their judgments so questionnaire scores wouldn't be the only determinant of higher-stakes decisions. It would seek to identify which places required facilitated learning, rather than define who was ready to be an effective teacher on the basis of a small sample regression.

Possible responsibilities linked to the professional reflection journal prompt: students describe a situation that made them uncomfortable with their understanding of a teacher's role, describe the values involved, and reflect on their response. Mentoring interview: discussions include areas like responsibility for learners, peer relationships, or professional obligations. These serve as an example of how identity reflection connects to real decisions, rather than superficial statements of intention, and were suggested as an application to education arising from our findings; we did not examine their impact on identity or preparedness.

Preparation, in a pedagogical context, could include rehearsals of teaching decisions in different contexts. In a microteaching session, a fellow trainee could play the role of the student

who misunderstands an explanation or finishes a task well before others. The presenter can select an action, explain, and then reconsider the decision after expert comment, or look at a sample of assessment evidence, adapt a task, or facilitate involvement. Noting the differences between planning and dealing with issues makes these activities relevant possibilities without claiming they are preferable to those above.

It is probable that confidence is combined with evidence in a cyclical pattern of practicum supervision. A student foresees a teaching problem, documents the situation, is given feedback, and then seeks to pursue it again. Mentors may distinguish between presentation confidence and responses to learners, while acknowledging the need for sound decision-making when a student shows uncertainty. At least three choices come to mind: managing concerns as a framework (Ma & Cavanagh, 2018); practical opportunities, feedback, and reflection as a lens (Tulomana et al., 2023); and the contextual variations that seem relevant.

Curriculum alignment could make these activities more coherent across stages of preparation. A methods course might cover an instructional principle, microteaching might require applying the principle with explanation, and practicum supervision could highlight the principle with reference to a classroom event. The portfolio could then incorporate the plan, evidence of its effectiveness with students, feedback on the plan, and a further application of the principle. This is simply an illustrative itinerary, not a process to be followed in the project. It connects university preparation with school responsibilities while providing a context for reflecting on how one's understanding of the teacher's role develops.

Assessment needs to tease out each source of evidence. The reflective account might lead to a debate about interpretation, the written scenario about pedagogical rationale, the observed lesson about the evidence of realized action. The questionnaire might include pupils' own judgments without crowding out these other sources. Agreement between sources would support an interpretation; disagreement might point the way to a helpful mentoring question. This avoids turning a numerical score of preparedness into a broad gauge of success and allows subsequent research to explore whether perceived preparedness correlates with forms of professional activity that the curriculum aims to develop.

4.5. Limitations and directions for further research

The study sample was 17 students, all purposively sampled from one single school. This composition limits generalizability, and the small sample size limits precise estimates of the phenomenon. The participants all had either current or expired practicum placements, and the analysis did not note variation in context within the sample. Rates of responses and expectations for the wider group are not specified in the abstract, and there is no mention of any systematic bias for who chose to respond or not. Therefore, these findings should be considered a bounded pattern within the program population, rather than a profile.

All constructs in the present study were assessed using self-report measures. Nevertheless, content overlap, common method variance, and response styles could have confounded the relationships among constructs. Internal consistency coefficients do not establish the content validity or uniqueness of measures. Further, validated response anchors are needed before categorical inferences can be made. Such measurement concerns are especially problematic for discriminating pedagogical knowledge from perceived capability and readiness.

The extra intervals and VIFs are based on rounded summaries and cannot be used in place of observation-level diagnostics. Therefore, the model assumptions and the investigation of

influential cases remain unaddressed. The cross-sectional design of the study also does not allow a causal direction to be established or for growth over time to be examined. Future studies should provide stronger evidence for validity using objective pedagogic tasks, classroom observations, and repeated measures. Larger samples could then examine contextual differences and determine whether the fitted relationships are likely to be replicated in independent samples.

5. Conclusion

Teacher identity and self-rated pedagogical knowledge were positively related to the seventeen EFL pre-service teachers' perceived readiness to teach. Both variables remained positive in the combined model, suggesting that professional self-identity and pedagogical self-assessment are likely both worth considering simultaneously. Furthermore, the patterns of the two items raise a need to distinguish confidence in predictable tasks from readiness for wider classroom activities. These results contribute to the research body on the significance of reflective professional discussion, flexible judgment, and connecting self-assessment with classroom evidence via mentoring, while falling short of establishing causal or primary effects and validated future prediction of teaching performance. With limited validity evidence and diagnostic information, a small nonprobability sample, and a self-evaluation design, the model is exploratory, with a brief report of the sampled teachers' concurrent perceptions and a stepping stone for more rigorous research.

References

- Anandari, C. L., Suryaman, M., & Basikin, B. (2025). Am I ready to teach?" EFL pre-service teachers' mental readiness to teach and implication for teacher education. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 28(2), 809–827. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v28i2.12090>
- Arvaja, M. (2016). Building teacher identity through the process of positioning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 392–402. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.024>
- Blömeke, S., Gustafsson, J.-E., & Shavelson, R. J. (2015). Beyond Dichotomies: Competence Viewed as a Continuum. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie*, 223(1), 3–13. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1027/2151-2604/a000194>
- Cania, M., Kusriandi, W., & Dwiniasih, D. (2024). EFL pre-service teachers' self-efficacy beliefs during teaching practicum. *IJIET (International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching)*, 8(1), 88–100. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v8i1.5051>
- Farmasari, S., Wardana, L. A., Baharuddin, B., & Suryaningsih, H. (2026). Predicting Future Identity of English For Young Learner (EYL) Teachers: Investigating How Coursework Shapes Pre-Service Teachers' Identities and Teaching Readiness. *Script Journal: Journal of Linguistics and English Teaching*, 11(1), 139–153. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24903/sj.v11i1.2344>
- Hu, P., & Xu, H. (2024). Student Teachers' Perceptions and Application of Questionnaire Survey in an EFL Context. *Sage Open*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440241245621>
- Huang, J., Sang, G., & Wenjie, H. (2023). Motivation to teach and preparedness for teaching among preservice teachers in China: The effect of conscientiousness and constructivist teaching beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology Educational Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1116321>
- Kohnke, L., & Zou, D. (2025). Artificial intelligence integration in TESOL teacher education: Promoting a critical lens guided by TPACK and SAMR. *TESOL Quarterly*, 59, 267–278.

- König, J., Bremerich-Vos, A., Buchholtz, C., & Glutsch, N. (2020). General pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical adaptivity in written lesson plans, and instructional practice among preservice teachers. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 52, 800–822. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2020.1752804>
- Lakew, B. M., Filatie, A. Y., & Chanie, B. S. (2025). Exploring innovative pedagogical approaches: Primary school EFL teachers' utilization of teaching strategies. *Cogent Education*, 12(1), 2510030. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2510030>
- Latva-aho, J., Näykki, P., Pyykkönen, S., Laitinen-Väänänen, S., Hirsto, L., & Veermans, M. (2024). Pre-service teachers' ways of understanding, observing, and supporting self-regulated learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 149, 104719. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2024.104719>
- Ma, K., & Cavanagh, M. S. (2018). Classroom Ready? Pre-Service Teachers' Self-Efficacy for Their First Professional Experience Placement. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(7), 134–151. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n7.8>
- Manasia, L., Ianos, M. G., & Chicioareanu, T. D. (2020). Pre-Service Teacher Preparedness for Fostering Education for Sustainable Development: An Empirical Analysis of Central Dimensions of Teaching Readiness. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 166. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010166>
- Pennington, M. C., & Richards, J. C. (2016). Teacher identity in language teaching: Integrating personal, contextual, and professional factors. *RELC Journal*, 47(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216631219>
- Pradev, H. R., Kurniawan, R. Y., & Bin Abd Majid, M. Z. (2023). Self-Efficacy, Teaching Practice, and Teacher Readiness: Mediating Role Teacher Interest Authors. *International Journal of Emerging Research and Review*, 1(3), 000039. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.56707/ijocer.v1i3.39>
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge Growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004>
- Tulomana, J., Tagimaucia, V., & Chand, S. P. (2023). Assessing the Readiness of Pre-service Teachers to Teach English to ESL Learners in Fijian Secondary Schools. *BELT - Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 14(1), e44931. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2023.1.44931>
- Tutyandari, C. (2022). English language pre-service teachers' sense of preparedness for teaching: An Indonesian case. *TEFLIN Journal*, 33(2), 367–385. <https://doi.org/http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0894-2284>
- Utegulov, D., Mailybayeva, G., Kaldybayeva, A., Demesheva, G., & Bataeva, S. (2026). Reconceptualizing teacher preparation for gifted learners in inclusive education: Differentiation as a structuring principle of professional readiness. *Frontiers in Education*, 11, 1–20. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1813609>
- Zhao, H., & Zhang, X. (2017). The Influence of Field Teaching Practice on Pre-service Teachers' Professional Identity: A Mixed Methods Study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1264. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01264>