SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

STUDENTS' VOCABULARY KNOWLEDGE, LITERARY COMPETENCE, AND ORAL INTERPRETATION SKILLS

Byrna Jane P. Lanuza

ABSTRACT

This study examined the vocabulary knowledge and literary competence of second-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSED) students majoring in General Science and their relationship with oral interpretation skills at JH Cerilles State College–Main Campus during Academic Year 2015–2016. A descriptive-correlational design was used. The respondents comprised all 32 students in the identified cohort: 15 males and 17 females. Data were gathered through a vocabulary knowledge test covering structural analysis and context clues, a literary competence test covering literary information and literary interpretation, and an oral interpretation rubric assessing physical presence, tone/verbal interpretation, pausing and pacing, and clarity and expression. The reported mean percentage scores showed that male students obtained a good level of vocabulary knowledge (70.67%), while female students obtained a very good level (80.39%). Both groups obtained a very poor overall level of literary competence (44.50% for males and 47.20% for females). Oral interpretation ratings were generally good, although clarity and expression was rated poor among male students and good among female students. Analysis of variance indicated a significant gender difference in vocabulary knowledge and in clarity and expression, but not in the reported literary competence indicators or the other oral interpretation indicators. The original manuscript reports relationships between vocabulary knowledge and oral interpretation and between literary competence and oral interpretation; however, the correlation coefficients and associated probability values require verification against the original statistical output before these relationships can be reported conclusively. The findings point to the need for integrated vocabulary instruction, explicit literary interpretation activities, and structured oral performance practice.

KEYWORDS: *Vocabulary Knowledge, Literary Competence, Oral Interpretation, Gender Differences, BSED Students, Descriptive-Correlational Research*

INTRODUCTION

Language competence involves more than the ability to recognize words or produce grammatically acceptable sentences. Learners must also interpret meaning, respond to literary texts, and communicate ideas and emotions effectively. In teacher education, these capacities are especially relevant because future teachers are expected to model language use, facilitate reading and literature learning, and communicate clearly before varied audiences. Vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation are therefore related areas of language learning that merit attention in the preparation of preservice teachers.

Vocabulary knowledge supports the comprehension and use of language. Knowing a word involves more than recalling a definition; it includes recognizing its form, understanding its meaning, identifying relationships with other words, and selecting it appropriately in context. Research on second-language learning consistently demonstrates an association between vocabulary knowledge and comprehension. A meta-analysis by Zhang and Zhang (2022), which synthesized more than 100 studies involving nearly 21,000 learners, reported a moderate overall relationship between vocabulary knowledge and second-language reading comprehension. Recent studies likewise distinguish vocabulary breadth—the number of words a learner knows—from vocabulary depth, or the quality and range of knowledge associated with those words (Dagnaw, 2023; Rabadi, 2023; Tong et al., 2023).

Literary competence involves the ability to understand how literary texts communicate meaning through elements such as character, theme, setting, point of view, imagery, and figurative language. It also includes the reader's capacity to develop, support, and reconsider interpretations. Contemporary work in language education emphasizes that literary learning can contribute to linguistic, cultural, and interpretive development when learners engage actively with texts rather than merely recall predetermined answers (Calafato & Hunstadbråten, 2025; Calafato & Simmonds, 2022). Nevertheless, students may experience difficulty interpreting literary texts when they have limited vocabulary, insufficient background knowledge, or inadequate familiarity with literary devices (Gomez, 2022).

Oral interpretation requires a reader or performer to communicate a literary selection through voice and physical expression. The delivery of a poem or other literary work involves appropriate tone, phrasing, pacing, pausing, clarity, facial expression, posture, and gestures. Research on oral reading prosody explains that expressive reading is not simply a matter of speaking loudly or dramatically; it reflects the coordination of word recognition, phrasing, timing, intonation, and meaning (Morrison & Wilcox, 2020; Wolters et al., 2022). Recent guidance also identifies intonation, amplitude, and timing as observable features that can inform classroom assessment and instruction (Sáez et al., 2025).

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Although these areas are conceptually connected, students may demonstrate different levels of performance across them. A learner may recognize and use words adequately but still struggle to interpret a poem, or may perform a text aloud with confidence while showing limited understanding of its literary features. The relationship among vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation therefore deserves empirical examination within specific learning contexts.

The present study focused on second-year BSED students majoring in General Science at JH Cerilles State College–Main Campus during AY 2015–2016. It examined students' vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation skills; tested gender-based differences in these variables; and investigated the relationships of vocabulary knowledge and literary competence with oral interpretation. The study also sought to formulate an action plan responsive to the results. Because the data were collected in 2015–2016, the findings describe that particular cohort and should not be interpreted as a current profile of the institution's students.

Statement of the Problem

This study assessed the vocabulary knowledge and literary competence of second-year BSED General Science students in relation to their oral interpretation skills. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of vocabulary knowledge of male and female students?
2. Is there a significant difference in vocabulary knowledge between male and female students?
3. What is the level of students' literary competence in terms of literary information and literary interpretation?
4. Is there a significant difference in literary competence between male and female students?
5. What is the level of oral interpretation skills in terms of physical presence, tone/verbal interpretation, pausing and pacing, and clarity and expression?
6. Is there a significant difference in oral interpretation skills between male and female students across the identified criteria?
7. Is there a significant relationship between (a) vocabulary knowledge and oral interpretation skills and (b) literary competence and oral interpretation skills?
8. What action plan may be proposed based on the findings?

Hypotheses

At the .05 level of significance, the study tested whether male and female students differed in vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation skills, and whether vocabulary knowledge and literary competence were significantly related to oral interpretation skills.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

Vocabulary Knowledge

Vocabulary knowledge is multidimensional. Breadth refers to the number of lexical items a learner recognizes or understands, whereas depth concerns how well the learner knows each word, including its meanings, associations, grammatical behavior, collocations, and constraints on use. These dimensions are related but are not interchangeable. A learner may recognize many words but have limited ability to use them precisely, or may know fewer words in considerable depth. For this reason, contemporary vocabulary research recommends examining more than a single measure of word knowledge.

Evidence from second-language research supports the importance of vocabulary for comprehension. Zhang and Zhang's (2022) meta-analysis found a moderate relationship between vocabulary knowledge and reading and listening comprehension across a large body of research. Dagnaw (2023) reported positive relationships between vocabulary breadth, vocabulary depth, and reading comprehension among university learners. Rabadi (2023) similarly found that breadth and depth were associated with English reading comprehension, with depth showing an important explanatory contribution in the study context. These findings suggest that vocabulary development should include both the expansion of known words and the strengthening of knowledge about words already encountered.

More recent evidence reinforces the need to consider distinct vocabulary dimensions. Tong et al. (2023) found that receptive vocabulary knowledge, particularly receptive depth, was closely associated with L2 reading proficiency in their sample of university learners. Zhang (2025) examined vocabulary breadth, depth, and fluency and found that the dimensions contributed differently to reading and listening performance. The results caution against treating vocabulary knowledge as a single, undifferentiated ability. They also indicate that the relationship between vocabulary and performance depends partly on the language skill being assessed.

The present study measured vocabulary knowledge through structural analysis and context clues. Structural analysis requires learners to examine meaningful word parts, such as roots, prefixes, and suffixes, to infer meaning. Context-clue use involves drawing on surrounding words, sentences, or passages to infer an unfamiliar word. These strategies can support independent word learning, particularly when learners encounter unfamiliar vocabulary in academic or literary texts. However, context is not always sufficient to determine a word's meaning; learners may need to combine contextual information with morphological analysis and reference tools.

In interpreting the present findings, the distinction between the study's operational measure and broader contemporary models of vocabulary knowledge is important. The instrument assessed structural analysis and context clues; it did not directly measure all dimensions of vocabulary breadth, depth, receptive knowledge, or productive use. Therefore, the results should be understood as

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

performance on the specific vocabulary test used in the study rather than as a complete measurement of every aspect of students' lexical competence.

Literary Competence

Literary competence refers to the knowledge and interpretive abilities that enable readers to engage meaningfully with literary works. It includes familiarity with literary concepts and conventions as well as the ability to interpret how textual elements contribute to meaning. Literary information may include knowledge of genres, elements, and figures of speech. Literary interpretation requires readers to infer character motivation, identify themes, examine conflicts and settings, recognize point of view, interpret figurative language, and explain the values or implications conveyed by a text.

Current literature education research emphasizes active interpretation and the development of learners' capacity to support their readings of texts. Calafato and Simmonds (2022) examined relationships among literary response, aesthetic competence, and literary competence in the EFL classroom, highlighting the importance of learners' responses to literary works. Calafato and Hunstadbråten (2025) further describe literary competence as an important component of foreign-language education, with implications for learners' linguistic and cultural development. These perspectives support classroom practices that invite students to explore textual meaning, justify interpretations, and consider how literary form and language shape readers' responses.

Literary interpretation can be challenging when learners lack the linguistic resources or background knowledge needed to make sense of a text. In a Philippine study, Gomez (2022) identified limited prior knowledge, weak vocabulary, and unfamiliarity with literary devices among the challenges students encountered when interpreting literary texts. Participants described seeking teacher assistance, collaborating with peers, and using available learning materials as ways of coping. Such findings point to the need for explicit instruction in literary terms and devices, guided reading, collaborative discussion, and repeated opportunities to explain interpretations.

The instrument in the present study examined literary information and literary interpretation. The distinction is useful because knowing the names or definitions of literary concepts does not automatically mean that a learner can apply them when analyzing a poem or short story. A student may identify a figure of speech but still find it difficult to explain its contribution to a poem's meaning. Similarly, recalling the elements of fiction does not necessarily demonstrate the ability to interpret character, theme, or conflict. The two indicators should therefore be considered complementary aspects of literary competence.

The study's reported results show a very poor overall level of literary competence for both male and female groups. This finding indicates a need to strengthen both knowledge of literary concepts and the application of interpretive skills. It should not, however, be generalized to all BSED students or current cohorts because the participants came from one program and one academic year.

Oral Interpretation Skills

Oral interpretation is the expressive communication of a literary selection to an audience. It requires the performer to convey the intellectual and emotional meaning of a text through vocal and physical resources. The present study assessed four criteria: physical presence, tone or verbal interpretation, pausing and pacing, and clarity and expression. Physical presence includes posture, facial expression, confidence, and audience contact. Tone or verbal interpretation concerns the use of vocal variation to communicate meaning and emotion. Pausing and pacing involve the timing and phrasing of oral delivery, while clarity and expression concern distinct articulation and the appropriate use of pitch, tone, volume, and emphasis.

Recent research on oral reading fluency gives a useful basis for understanding the vocal dimensions of oral interpretation, although oral reading fluency and literary performance are not identical constructs. Morrison and Wilcox (2020) reviewed approaches to assessing expressive oral reading and discussed the challenges of evaluating rate, accuracy, and prosody. Wolters et al. (2022), in a meta-analysis of 35 studies involving 9,349 learners, reported a moderate relationship between reading prosody and reading comprehension. Their findings indicate that prosody is multidimensional and that rating scales and acoustic features may capture different aspects of expressive reading.

Chung and Bidelman (2022) examined acoustic features of oral reading prosody and their relationship with reading fluency and comprehension. Their work supports attention to pitch and duration variation as features of oral reading performance. Sáez et al. (2025) also explain that intonation, amplitude, and timing can help teachers identify differences in reading performance and guide instruction. These studies reinforce the value of assessing not only whether a learner reads aloud, but also how the learner uses vocal features to communicate the structure and meaning of a text.

Oral interpretation also involves physical communication. Posture, facial expression, gestures, and audience awareness can support the meaning conveyed through the voice. These features should be appropriate to the literary selection rather than exaggerated or used independently of the text. In the present study, the oral interpretation rubric included physical presence alongside vocal criteria, allowing the performance to be examined as a combination of verbal and nonverbal delivery.

The findings of this study should be interpreted within the limits of its assessment task, which involved reading aloud a poem. They do not necessarily represent students' competence in all forms of oral communication, such as spontaneous speech, debate, conversation, or public speaking.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Gender and Language-Related Performance

Gender differences in language performance should be interpreted cautiously. A difference observed in one cohort or on one instrument does not establish an inherent or universal advantage for one gender. Performance may be influenced by prior learning opportunities, language exposure, reading habits, educational experiences, familiarity with the assessment task, and other contextual factors. Contemporary research on vocabulary and reading also demonstrates that different dimensions of language knowledge may relate to performance in different ways (Tong et al., 2023; Zhang, 2025).

Accordingly, the present study treats gender as a grouping variable used to compare the performance of the male and female respondents. The findings are reported as differences within the 32-student cohort only. They should not be used to make broad claims about the language abilities of males and females. Instructional decisions should instead respond to the specific areas of need demonstrated by individual learners and by the cohort as a whole.

Synthesis and Research Gap

The reviewed literature establishes that vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation are related but distinct areas of language performance. Vocabulary breadth and depth are associated with comprehension, while literary competence involves both knowledge of literary concepts and the ability to construct interpretations. Oral interpretation draws on vocal prosody and physical expression to communicate a text's meaning. Recent studies provide evidence for each area, but findings from one context cannot automatically be applied to another.

The present study contributes a context-specific account of these variables among second-year BSED General Science students at JH Cerilles State College–Main Campus in AY 2015–2016. It also examines gender-based differences and the relationships of vocabulary knowledge and literary competence with oral interpretation. The study's measures are narrower than some contemporary constructs: vocabulary was assessed through structural analysis and context clues, literary competence through information and interpretation, and oral interpretation through four rubric criteria. This operational focus is retained in the analysis and discussion.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-correlational research design. The descriptive component was used to determine the levels of students' vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation skills. The correlational component was used to examine the relationships of vocabulary knowledge and literary competence with oral interpretation. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test gender-based differences, while Pearson's product-moment correlation was identified as the procedure for examining relationships among the variables.

Research Environment and Respondents

The study was conducted at JH Cerilles State College–Main Campus, located in Barangay Mati, San Miguel, Zamboanga del Sur. The respondents were the 32 second-year BSED students majoring in General Science during AY 2015–2016. The group consisted of 15 male and 17 female students. The study included the entire identified cohort; thus, no separate sampling procedure was used.

Respondent group	Frequency	Percentage
Male	15	46.88%
Female	17	53.12%
Total	32	100.00%

Research Instruments

Three instruments were used. The vocabulary knowledge questionnaire consisted of two parts: structural analysis and context clues, with 15 multiple-choice items in each part and four response options per item. The literary competence instrument assessed literary information and literary interpretation. The manuscript describes the literary information component as containing 10 items in the first round and 20 in the second round, while the literary interpretation component contained 20 items in both rounds; the instrument also included tasks involving figures of speech and drawing values from a poem. The oral interpretation rubric assessed students as they read a poem aloud. Its criteria were physical presence, tone/verbal interpretation, pausing and pacing, and clarity and expression.

The original manuscript describes the instruments as validated but does not provide sufficient details about the validation procedure, reliability coefficients, or the names and qualifications of all validators. These details should be added only if the researcher can supply the supporting documentation. The rating rubric and the exact scoring procedures should likewise be checked against the original instruments before journal submission.

Data-Gathering Procedure

Permission to conduct the study was sought from the college administration and the dean of the College of Teacher Education. The vocabulary knowledge test was administered before the subject teacher taught the two literary selections. After the short story and

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

poem had been discussed in class, the literary competence assessment was administered. Students then read the poem aloud and were rated by three English teachers, including the researcher, using the oral interpretation rubric. The collected data were subsequently organized, analyzed, and interpreted with the assistance of a statistician.

Statistical Treatment

Descriptive statistics, including mean percentage scores and standard deviations where reported, were used to describe students' performance. The study used the following interpretive ranges for vocabulary and literary competence: 90.0–100.0, excellent; 80.0–89.9, very good; 70.0–79.9, good; 60.0–69.9, fair; 50.0–59.9, poor; and below 50.0, very poor. Oral interpretation ratings were interpreted as follows: 4.00, excellent; 3.00–3.99, good; 2.00–2.99, poor; and 1.00–1.99, very poor. ANOVA was used for group comparisons, and Pearson's r was specified for tests of relationships. The original manuscript indicates that data processing was conducted using SPSS.

The inferential results in the original tables require verification before final publication. In particular, the reported Pearson coefficient of 2.5961 is outside the possible range of Pearson's r. The reported coefficient of 0.8242 and p = .1066 in the second correlation table also appear inconsistent for a sample of 32. The original SPSS output must be consulted; no corrected coefficients are inferred in this draft.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Students' Vocabulary Knowledge

The reported mean percentage score for male students was 70.67%, interpreted as good. Female students obtained 80.39%, interpreted as very good. The descriptive results therefore show a higher mean percentage score for female students in the vocabulary test used in this study.

Group	Mean percentage score	Interpretation
Male	70.67%	Good
Female	80.39%	Very good

The ANOVA result for vocabulary knowledge was F = 5.983, p = .021. Since the reported probability value was below .05, the study found a statistically significant difference between the male and female groups in vocabulary knowledge. The result is limited to the cohort and the two test components—structural analysis and context clues. It does not establish that one gender generally has stronger vocabulary knowledge.

This finding may be considered alongside recent research showing that vocabulary performance varies according to the dimension being measured and the language skill involved. Zhang (2025) found that breadth, depth, and fluency did not contribute identically to reading and listening performance. The present study did not assess those three dimensions separately; nevertheless, the result reinforces the importance of describing precisely what a vocabulary test measures. Instructionally, students may benefit from activities that develop word-part analysis, contextual inference, and repeated use of newly learned words in meaningful language tasks.

Students' Literary Competence

Both groups obtained a very poor overall level of literary competence. Male students recorded an overall mean percentage score of 44.50%, while female students recorded 47.20%. For literary information, the male group obtained 56.00% and the female group 59.27%, both interpreted as poor. For literary interpretation, male students obtained 33.00% and female students 35.14%, both interpreted as very poor.

Indicator	Male MPS	Male interpretation	Female MPS	Female interpretation
Literary information	56.00%	Poor	59.27%	Poor
Literary interpretation	33.00%	Very poor	35.14%	Very poor
Overall	44.50%	Very poor	47.20%	Very poor

The ANOVA results showed no statistically significant gender difference in literary information, F = 1.860, p = .183, or literary interpretation, F = 2.161, p = .151. Thus, the study did not find evidence of a gender-based difference in either indicator. The low scores in literary interpretation for both groups suggest that applying literary concepts to analyze a text was more difficult than answering items related to literary information.

This pattern is consistent with the distinction in recent literature between knowing literary terminology and demonstrating interpretive competence. Calafato and Simmonds (2022) emphasize literary response and aesthetic competence as dimensions relevant

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

to literary learning, while Gomez (2022) documents students' difficulties with prior knowledge, vocabulary, and literary devices. The present results support the need for explicit instruction and guided practice in interpreting character, theme, figurative language, and values. Because the study was conducted in one cohort, the findings should be treated as a diagnostic indication for that group rather than a general statement about preservice teachers.

Students' Oral Interpretation Skills

The oral interpretation rubric assessed physical presence, tone/verbal interpretation, pausing and pacing, and clarity and expression. Male students received ratings of 3.1 for physical presence, 3.0 for tone/verbal interpretation, 3.2 for pausing and pacing, and 2.7 for clarity and expression. These ratings were interpreted as good for the first three criteria and poor for clarity and expression. Female students received ratings of 3.1, 3.1, 3.4, and 3.1, respectively, all interpreted as good.

Criterion	Male rating	Male interpretation	Female rating	Female interpretation
Physical presence	3.1	Good	3.1	Good
Tone/verbal interpretation	3.0	Good	3.1	Good
Pausing and pacing	3.2	Good	3.4	Good
Clarity and expression	2.7	Poor	3.1	Good

The ANOVA results indicated no significant difference in physical presence ($F = 0.003$, $p = .954$), tone/verbal interpretation ($F = 0.400$, $p = .532$), or pausing and pacing ($F = 1.019$, $p = .321$). A significant difference was reported for clarity and expression ($F = 4.740$, $p = .037$). Therefore, it would be inaccurate to state that there was no gender difference across every oral interpretation criterion. The evidence indicates that the groups did not differ significantly on three criteria, while a significant difference was reported for clarity and expression.

The descriptive ratings suggest that clarity and expression may be an area for focused practice, particularly for the male group in this cohort. The result should not be interpreted as an inherent gender difference. Oral reading research identifies prosody as a multidimensional performance feature involving timing, intonation, phrasing, and expressiveness (Morrison & Wilcox, 2020; Wolters et al., 2022). Sáez et al. (2025) likewise describe how teachers can attend to timing, amplitude, and intonation when assessing oral reading. Practice involving modeled readings, phrase marking, repeated rehearsal, and feedback may help learners improve expressive delivery.

Relationships Among the Study Variables

The original manuscript reports a statistically significant relationship between vocabulary knowledge and oral interpretation skills (reported $p = .0281$) and no statistically significant relationship between literary competence and oral interpretation skills (reported $p = .1066$). However, the correlation statistics in the original Tables 9 and 10 require verification. Table 9 lists Pearson's $r = 2.5961$, which is mathematically impossible because a Pearson correlation coefficient must range from −1.00 to +1.00. Table 10 lists $r = 0.8242$ with $p = .1066$; these values appear inconsistent with the stated sample size and must also be checked.

Once verified, the relationship results should be discussed without implying causation. A correlational design can establish whether variables are associated in the observed sample, but it cannot demonstrate that vocabulary knowledge or literary competence causes stronger oral interpretation. The discussion should also acknowledge the small, single-program cohort and the specific instruments used.

Proposed Action Plan

Based on the descriptive findings, the proposed action plan prioritizes literary information, literary interpretation, and oral delivery. The strategies below retain the areas identified in the original action plan while organizing them into implementable learning activities.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Focus area	Objective	Suggested strategies	Persons involved	Success indicator
Literary information	Strengthen understanding of literary terms, concepts, genres, elements, and figures of speech.	Use short text excerpts to identify genres and elements; build a class glossary; classify examples of figurative language; conduct brief retrieval and application activities.	English teachers and students	Students accurately identify and explain key literary concepts in class tasks.
Literary interpretation	Improve students' ability to interpret literary texts.	Guide students in interpreting tone, style, conflict, setting, point of view, character, theme, and symbols; use text-based questions and evidence-supported discussion; write short interpretations of assigned texts.	English teachers and students	Students produce interpretations supported by relevant textual evidence.
Oral interpretation	Improve clarity, expression, and expressive delivery.	Model effective reading aloud; mark phrase boundaries; rehearse poems; provide feedback on articulation, vocal variation, pauses, pacing, posture, and facial expression.	English teachers and students	Students demonstrate improved performance using the oral interpretation rubric.

CONCLUSION

The study found that male students demonstrated good vocabulary knowledge, while female students demonstrated very good vocabulary knowledge on the test administered. The reported ANOVA indicated a significant difference between the groups. Both groups demonstrated very poor overall literary competence, and no significant gender difference was found in literary information or literary interpretation. Oral interpretation ratings were generally good, although male students were rated poor in clarity and expression while female students were rated good. The inferential results showed no significant gender difference in physical presence, tone/verbal interpretation, and pausing and pacing, but a significant difference in clarity and expression.

The reported relationships between vocabulary knowledge, literary competence, and oral interpretation cannot be stated as definitive conclusions until the correlation coefficients and p-values are verified from the original SPSS output. This qualification is necessary to preserve the accuracy and credibility of the manuscript. Overall, the descriptive findings indicate that literary competence—particularly literary interpretation—was the most evident area requiring instructional attention in the cohort.

Recommendations

1. English teachers may provide systematic vocabulary activities that combine structural analysis, context clues, word relationships, and meaningful use of new vocabulary.
2. Literature instruction may include explicit teaching of literary concepts followed by guided interpretation of character, theme, setting, conflict, point of view, symbols, and figures of speech.
3. Students may be given regular opportunities to read poems and other literary selections aloud, with feedback on clarity, expression, pausing, pacing, tone, and physical presence.
4. Teachers may use performance rubrics and short formative assessments to identify individual strengths and needs rather than relying on gender-based assumptions.
5. School and teacher-education leaders may consider professional learning activities on vocabulary instruction, literature pedagogy, and expressive oral reading.
6. Future researchers may replicate the study with larger and more diverse samples, updated instruments, documented validity and reliability evidence, and statistical reporting that includes effect sizes and confidence intervals.
7. The researcher should retrieve the original SPSS output and verify all correlation coefficients, probability values, and decisions before submitting the manuscript for publication.

REFERENCES

1. *Calafato, R., & Hunstadbråten, S. (2025). Literature in language education: Exploring EFL learners' literary competence profiles. English Teaching & Learning, 49, 537–559. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-024-00193-w*
2. *Calafato, R., & Simmonds, K. (2022). Linkages between literary response, aesthetic competence, and literary competence in the EFL classroom. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 75, Article 101214. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2022.101214*
3. *Chung, W.-L., & Bidelman, G. M. (2022). Acoustic features of oral reading prosody and the relation with reading fluency and reading comprehension in Taiwanese children. Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research, 65(1), 334–343. https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_JSLHR-21-00252*
4. *Dagnaw, A. T. (2023). Revisiting the role of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension. Cogent Education, 10(1), Article 2217345. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2217345*

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 10| October 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

5. *Gomez, D. (2022). Interpreting literary texts: Recognizing and overcoming challenges. International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 11(13), 109–114. https://doi.org/10.5861/ijrse.2022.356*
6. *Morrison, T. G., & Wilcox, B. (2020). Assessing expressive oral reading fluency. Education Sciences, 10(3), Article 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10030059*
7. *Rabadi, R. I. (2023). Examining the role of breadth and depth of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension of English language learners. Jordan Journal of Modern Languages & Literatures, 15(1), 327–345. https://doi.org/10.47012/jjmll.15.1.17*
8. *Sáez, L., Whitney, M., Nese, J. F. T., Alonzo, J., & Nese, R. N. T. (2025). Reading prosody: A listening guide for teachers. The Reading Teacher, 78(4), 243–251. https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.2368*
9. *Tong, Y., Hasim, Z., & Abdul Halim, H. (2023). The relationship between L2 vocabulary knowledge and reading proficiency: The moderating effects of vocabulary fluency. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10, Article 555. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02058-2*
10. *Wolters, A., Kim, Y.-S. G., & Szura, J. W. (2022). Is reading prosody related to reading comprehension? A meta-analysis. Scientific Studies of Reading, 26(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888438.2020.1850733*
11. *Zhang, X. (2025). Vocabulary knowledge towards L2 reading and listening performance. Reading in a Foreign Language, 37(2), 109–126. https://doi.org/10.64152/10125/67500*
12. *Zhang, S., & Zhang, X. (2022). The relationship between vocabulary knowledge and L2 reading/listening comprehension: A meta-analysis. Language Teaching Research, 26(4), 696–725. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820913998*