



Academic and Practical Preparedness of Pre-Service Teachers for Experiential Learning

Article History:

Initial submission:	25 May 2026
First decision:	30 May 2026
Revision received:	08 July 2026
Accepted for publication:	13 July 2026
Online release:	17 July 2026

Jericho Andrew N. Paunillo¹, ORCID No. 0009-0003-3612-9447
Jonah Eliza Prado-Tordecillas², PhD, ORCID No. 0009-0006-4656-1972
Darlyn Grace A. Tolentino¹, ORCID No. 0009-0003-3235-2262
Genesis Wesley N. Paunillo¹, ORCID No. 0009-0007-3871-0461
Trishtan B. Apostol¹, ORCID No. 0009-0006-0012-1082

¹Third Year Student, Bachelor of Elementary Education, Aklan State University, Banga, Aklan, Philippines

²Instructor III, College of Teacher Education, Aklan State University, Banga, Aklan, Philippines

Abstract

Experiential learning integrates experience, reflection, and application, offering pre-service teachers authentic opportunities to connect theory with practice and prepare for classroom realities. This study investigated the academic and practical preparedness of third-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEd) students for Experiential Learning Course, focusing on their competencies in academic content mastery, instructional delivery, classroom management, instructional materials and technology, and intrinsic motivation. A descriptive quantitative design was employed, using a validated researcher-made survey administered to all 63 third-year BEd students through total population sampling. Data were analyzed using weighted mean and ranking to determine levels of preparedness. Findings revealed that students generally rated themselves as "Prepared" across all domains. Strengths were evident in lesson planning, classroom routines, and intrinsic motivation, while notable gaps emerged in handling classroom disruptions, formulating higher order questions, and designing assessments for critical thinking. These results highlight the transitional challenges faced by third-year BEd students as they move from theoretical coursework to practical classroom application. The study recommends practice-based learning, inquiry-driven strategies, simulation-based classroom management, workshops, seminars, and mentorship programs to bridge the gap between theory and practice. By addressing these areas, teacher education programs can better equip pre-service teachers for experiential learning and real-world classroom demands. This research contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education, ensuring that future educators are not only academically competent but also practically prepared to foster inclusive and effective learning environments.

Keywords: preparedness, experiential learning, teacher education, teaching internship, bachelor of elementary education



Copyright © 2026. The Author/s. Published by VMC Analytik Multidisciplinary Journal News Publishing Services. Academic and Practical Preparedness of Pre-Service Teachers for Experiential Learning © 2026 by Jericho Andrew N. Paunillo, Jonah Eliza Prado-Tordecillas, Darlyn Grace A. Tolentino, Genesis Wesley N. Paunillo and Trishtan B. Apostol is an open access article licensed under [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). This permits the copying, redistribution, remixing, transforming, and building upon the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially, provided that appropriate credit is given to the copyright owner/s through proper and standard citation.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher preparedness is a pressing global concern, as effective teaching significantly influences students' academic achievements and long-term outcomes. According to UNESCO (2023), the demand for teachers worldwide is projected to reach 44 million by 2030, teacher education is central to achieving SDG 4 on inclusive, equitable learning. In the Philippines, reforms such as the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 (RA 10533) and CHED Memorandum

Order No. 74 (2017) mandate experiential learning, requiring institutions to produce graduates who are academically competent and practically prepared for authentic classrooms.

Studies conducted both locally and internationally have examined pre-service teachers' readiness. Tan and Rodriguez (2016) highlighted that rigorous preparation is essential to meet the demands of the K to 12 program, stressing the importance of frequent training, workshops, and seminars. Rif'atullah

and Ciptaningrum (2024) emphasized the role of career development in shaping practicum readiness, while Sebastian and Villa (2026) demonstrated that demographic and academic factors significantly affect teaching competencies. These studies affirm the global recognition of preparedness as a cornerstone of effective teacher education.

Despite these efforts, most existing research generalizes teacher preparedness across all year levels (first to fourth year), thereby overlooking the critical transitional stage of third-year BEEd students who are about to engage in Experiential Learning. This stage is pivotal, as students must begin applying their accumulated academic knowledge in practical classroom contexts. Current studies have not adequately examined how academic content mastery, instructional delivery, classroom management, instructional materials and technology competence, and intrinsic motivation converge during this stage. This gap highlights the need to investigate the academic and practical preparedness of third-year BEEd students for the demands of the Experiential Learning course, which encompasses both Field Study and Teaching Internship.

This study aims to assess the academic and practical preparedness of third-year BEEd students for Experiential Learning. Specifically, it evaluates their competencies in academic content mastery, instructional delivery, classroom management, instructional materials and technology competence, and intrinsic motivation. By identifying strengths and weaknesses, the study seeks to provide research-based recommendations for teacher training programs and curriculum development. The ultimate goal is to enhance student readiness for actual classroom practice, ensuring they are fully equipped to meet the demands of real-world teaching.

This research contributes to Sustainable Development Goal 4: Quality Education, which calls for inclusive and equitable education and lifelong learning opportunities for all (United Nations, 2015). By evaluating and strengthening

pre-service teacher preparedness, this study supports the development of future competent educators who can deliver quality education in diverse classroom settings. It ensures that future teachers are not only academically prepared but also practically ready to foster inclusive and effective learning environments.

Statement of the Problem. Generally, the main focus of this study is to identify the extent to which third-year BEEd students are academically and practically prepared for the demands of experiential learning courses. Specifically, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of preparedness of third-year BEEd students in terms of:
 - 1.1 Academic Content Mastery;
 - 1.2 Instructional Delivery Skills
 - 1.3 Classroom Management Skills;
 - 1.4 Instructional Materials and Technology Competence; and
 - 1.5 Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness?
2. Which areas demonstrate the highest and lowest levels of preparedness among the students?
3. What recommendations can be proposed to strengthen the academic and practical preparedness of third-year BEEd students for experiential learning?

Scope and Limitations. This study focused on assessing the academic and practical preparedness of third-year Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) students enrolled at Aklan State University–Main Campus for the Experiential Learning Course, which includes both Field Study and Teaching Internship. The scope covered five major domains of teacher preparedness: academic content mastery, instructional delivery skills, classroom management skills, instructional materials and technology competence, and intrinsic motivation and teaching readiness. The respondents consisted of all 63 third-year BEEd students from the College of Teacher Education,

ensuring comprehensive representation through total enumeration sampling.

However, several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study was conducted within a single institution and year level, which may constrain the generalizability of findings to other campuses, programs, or cohorts. Second, the data relied on self-reported perceptions of preparedness, which may be influenced by personal bias, social desirability, or varying self-assessments of competencies. Third, the study focused primarily on the five domains identified in the instrument, excluding other relevant dimensions such as emotional resilience, adaptability to diverse classroom contexts, and long-term teaching performance. Finally, the descriptive quantitative design provided valuable numerical insights but did not capture deeper qualitative experiences of students as they transitioned to experiential learning. Future research may incorporate mixed-methods approaches and multiple institutions to provide richer insights into the experiential learning preparedness of pre-service teachers.

The respondents consisted of all 63 third-year BEEd students from the College of Teacher Education, ensuring a comprehensive representation of the population through total enumeration sampling. Data was gathered using a validated researcher-made survey questionnaire, analyzed through weighted mean and ranking to determine levels of preparedness.

This study was limited to a single institution and year level, restricting generalizability. Findings relied on self-reported perceptions, which may reflect bias. The focus was confined to academic and practical domains, excluding factors like resilience and adaptability. While the descriptive quantitative design provided numerical insights, it did not capture deeper qualitative experiences. Future research should include multiple institutions and qualitative approaches for richer perspectives on pre-service teachers' preparedness.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Experiential Learning Courses (ELC) are transformative in developing pre-service teachers' competencies. Bilbao (2010) noted their role in fostering growth, Aquino (2022) highlighted confidence-building, while Cabral (2022) and Burac (2020) confirmed their link to instructional competence and learning outcomes. These studies affirm experiential learning as central in bridging theory and practice. Yet, weaknesses in planning and assessment (Bilbao, 2010) limit its potential, especially for BEEd students who may be confident in delivery but struggle with academic rigor. Strengthening ELC ensures pre-service teachers become reflective educators capable of translating theory into effective classroom practice.

Experiential Learning Courses (ELC) in BEEd programs significantly enhance teaching competencies and professional development, as supported by multiple studies. Bilbao et al. (2010), in a survey of 2,027 prospective teachers across 72 institutions, found that ELC most strongly improved personal growth and professional development, though competencies in planning, assessing, and reporting showed the least enhancement. Aquino (2022), studying 42 BEEd students in Field Study courses, reported that experiential learning transformed fears about teaching into positive perspectives. Cabral (2022) confirmed very satisfactory performance in instructional competence, professional characteristics, and attendance among BEEd student teachers. Similarly, Burac (2020) noted that intended learning outcomes were "very much achieved" when experiential processes were properly implemented.

Academic content mastery is a strong predictor of teaching effectiveness, forming the foundation of instructional quality. Ramos (2026) found low mathematics mastery among pre-service teachers, particularly in number sense, measurement, and algebra, recommending curriculum reforms aligned with PPST Domain 1. Winget and Persky (2022)

showed structured mastery learning enhances performance, while Raihanah et al. (2024) emphasized integrating content, pedagogy, and technology for holistic preparation. Matjašič and Vogrinc (2024) underscored research competence as vital for reflective practice, though inconsistently defined. Palacios and Reedy (2024) demonstrated practicums help apply theoretical knowledge, while Sathasivam et al. (2024) revealed persistent theory-practice gaps in classroom management and lesson planning. Prastikawati et al. (2024) complemented these findings, showing formative assessment and mentorship strengthen teaching competencies and learner outcomes.

Instructional delivery skills—lesson planning, questioning, and clarity of instruction—are central to engaging learners and promoting higher-order thinking. Panganoron-Jabonete (2022) found preservice English teachers integrated critical thinking through higher-order questioning and communicative tasks, though weaker in interviews and diaries. Pecore et al. (2022) showed experiential practice in virtual simulations improved questioning and discussion, while DeSantis et al. (2023) demonstrated data-driven feedback in mixed-reality simulations significantly increased higher-order questioning. Barseghyan and Hovakimyan (2024) highlighted funneling and open-ended questioning in EFL contexts as fostering curiosity and autonomy. Hermansyah et al. (2023) synthesized evidence that probing and reflective questions enhance cognitive and metacognitive development, and Rasyid et al. (2022) confirmed questioning strategies improve critical thinking in Islamic university classrooms. Sasson and Tifferet (2024) found active instructional practices boost metacognitive awareness and self-efficacy, while Giacomazzi et al. (2023) showed professional development in instructional design strengthened Ugandan teachers' lesson planning for critical thinking.

Academic Content Mastery. Ramos (2026) reported low mathematics mastery among pre-service teachers, reflecting PPST Domain 1's

emphasis on content knowledge. Winget and Persky (2022) showed mastery learning improves performance through structured progression, while Raihanah et al. (2024) stressed integrating content, pedagogy, and technology. Palacios & Reedy (2024) and Sathasivam et al. (2024) revealed persistent theory-practice gaps, underscoring mentorship's role in bridging them. Academic mastery underpins teaching effectiveness; without deep subject knowledge, instruction risks superficiality. BEd students often gain theoretical understanding but struggle to apply it in classrooms, highlighting the need for curriculum reform.

Evidence shows academic content mastery as central to teaching effectiveness. Ramos (2026) found low mathematics mastery among pre-service teachers, particularly in number sense, measurement, and algebra, urging curriculum reforms aligned with PPST Domain 1. Winget and Persky (2022) demonstrated that structured mastery learning improves performance, while Raihanah et al. (2024) emphasized integrating content, pedagogy, and technology for holistic preparation. Matjašič and Vogrinc (2024) highlighted research competence as vital for reflective practice, though inconsistently defined. Palacios & Reedy (2024) and Sathasivam et al. (2024) noted persistent theory-practice gaps, and Prastikawati et al. (2024) showed mentorship and formative assessment enhance teaching competencies.

Instructional Delivery and Classroom Management. Instructional delivery—anchored in lesson planning, questioning, and clarity—is vital for engaging learners and fostering higher-order thinking. Panganoron-Jabonete (2022) found preservice English teachers integrated critical thinking through role plays and group work, though weaker in interviews and diaries. Pecore et al. (2022) showed deliberate practice in virtual simulations sharpened questioning, while DeSantis et al. (2023) demonstrated data-driven feedback in mixed-reality coaching improved higher-order questioning. Barseghyan and Hovakimyan (2024) highlighted funneling and open-ended

questioning in EFL contexts as nurturing curiosity and autonomy, and Hermansyah et al. (2023) synthesized evidence that probing and reflective questioning enhanced cognitive and metacognitive growth. Rasyid et al. (2022) confirmed questioning strategies strengthen critical thinking in Islamic university classrooms. Sasson and Tifferet (2024) found active instructional practices build metacognitive awareness and self-efficacy, while Giacomazzi et al. (2023) showed professional development improved lesson planning for critical thinking.

Classroom management remains a cornerstone of teaching success. Manajemen Kelas (2022) emphasized its role in minimizing disruptions, Behera (2024) and Yasin et al. (2022) identified strategies for discipline and engagement, and Kucukakin & Göloğlu Demir (2021) linked management practices to student motivation and outcomes. Although BEEd students often excel in management (Heretape, 2023), challenges persist in lesson planning and higher-order questioning.

Classroom management is a strong predictor of teaching success, shaping engagement, discipline, and learning outcomes. Locally, Manajemen Kelas (2022) emphasized that effective management—through physical arrangement, behavioral interventions, and teacher competencies like communication and time management—reduces disruptions and fosters character development. Rahmadani et al. (2023) noted persistent misconceptions, often reduced to seating and facilities, rather than broader teacher roles. Globally, Behera (2024) identified common disruptive behaviors and stressed constructive strategies, while Yasin et al. (2022) highlighted seating, engagement, and participation as key to instructional quality. Hasnanto (2024) underscored positive discipline and teacher-student interaction in creating supportive environments, and Kucukakin and Göloğlu Demir (2021) synthesized a decade of research linking management practices to motivation, academic engagement, and outcomes.

Instructional Materials and Technology Competence. Instructional materials and technology are integral to modern pedagogy, enhancing effectiveness and fostering innovation. Pecson and Sarmiento (2023) found that while instructional materials improve teaching and cater to diverse learning styles, challenges in access and preparation persist. Prihatin et al. (2023) and Calavia et al. (2022) showed ICT-based and design-thinking approaches foster creativity and adaptability, while Limbong and Wadham (2024) reported adequate digital competence but ongoing connectivity issues. The literature also indicates BEEd students can design instructional materials yet often lack confidence in integrating technology, limiting adaptability to diverse learners. Strengthening technological proficiency is therefore essential for pre-service teachers to meet digital classroom demands and deliver inclusive, innovative instruction aligned with 21st-century expectations.

Prihatin et al. (2023) developed ICT-based trigonometric materials for face-to-face and distance learning, finding high validity and positive reception. Limbong and Wadham (2024), using the DigCompEdu framework, reported adequate digital competence among pre-service English teachers but noted persistent connectivity and software challenges. Calavia et al. (2022) introduced the Think-Create-Teach methodology, showing that design thinking enhances the creation of effective instructional materials.

Intrinsic Motivation and Professional Readiness. Lopez and Irene (2017) and Abuloc and Limpot (2026) reported high intrinsic motivation among pre-service teachers. Umara et al. (2024) and Huang et al. (2023) confirmed that motivation predicts professional readiness, while Uysal (2023) linked motivation to competence, job satisfaction, and reduced burnout. Segumpan et al. (2025) highlighted low licensure pass rates as a systemic challenge, and Robinos et al. (2025) noted limited practicum exposure undermining preparedness.

Intrinsic motivation strongly predicts teaching readiness, with self-efficacy as a key mediator across contexts. Lopez and Irene (2017) found 255 pre-service teachers highly motivated and committed, driven by intrinsic and altruistic factors. Abuloc and Limpot (2026) reported high learning motivation, blended learning readiness, and self-efficacy among 500 pre-service students, with significant interrelations. Internationally, Umara et al. (2024) showed intrinsic motivation influences readiness through self-efficacy by 74.1% (167 Indonesian participants), while Huang et al. (2023) confirmed positive prediction of preparedness among 383 Chinese participants. Bilim (2014) likewise linked intrinsic motives to teaching self-efficacy, and Tang et al. (2015) demonstrated effects on professional competence via professional learning. Uysal (2023), in a review of 48 studies, associated intrinsic motivation with competence, job satisfaction, and reduced burnout.

Heretape (2023) reported high readiness in lesson planning, teaching strategies, and very high classroom management. Yet licensure performance remains critical, with BEEd pass rates dropping to 20.05% in 2017 compared to BSEd's 41.46% in 2018, a 19.69-point gap (Segumpan et al., 2025). Theory-practice gaps also persist: Favor (2026) found moderately high ecological knowledge ($M=3.84$) and strong pro-environmental attitudes ($M=4.12$), but only moderate ecological practices ($M=3.73$). Suarez et al. (2026) noted teaching anxiety during practicum transitions, while Robinos et al. (2025) highlighted limited public school exposure despite strong theoretical preparation.

Teacher preparedness spans experiential learning, academic mastery, instructional delivery, classroom management, technological competence, and intrinsic motivation. Studies highlight persistent gaps between theory and practice, particularly in lesson planning, assessment, and technology integration. BEEd students may show readiness in some areas but remain vulnerable in others, especially during experiential learning. Literature emphasizes

the importance of evaluating both academic and practical competencies in alignment with RA 10533 (Enhanced Basic Education Act), CHED CMO No. 74, s. 2017, and the PPST framework.

METHODS

Research Design. This study used a descriptive quantitative design to assess the academic and practical preparedness of third-year BEEd students for experiential learning. The respondents were all 63 third-year BEEd students at Aklan State University – College of Teacher Education (AY 2025–2026), selected through total enumeration sampling.

Respondents. A total of 63 third-year BEEd students enrolled at Aklan State University under the College of Teacher Education during AY 2025–2026 were the respondents of the study. Using total enumeration, the study ensured full representation and reliable descriptive analysis. These students were at a pivotal stage of their program, transitioning from academic coursework to Field Study and Teaching Internship, where theoretical knowledge is applied in classroom practice.

Ethical Considerations. All ethical protocols were strictly observed. The anonymity and confidentiality of respondents were safeguarded, with data used solely for academic purposes. During survey administration, students were assured of their right to self-determination, allowing them to withhold responses to any item.

Data Collection and Instruments. A researcher-made questionnaire was developed from related literature and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), covering five domains: academic content mastery, instructional delivery, classroom management, instructional materials and technology competence, and intrinsic motivation and teaching readiness. Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale (5–Very High to 1–Very Low Preparedness), enabling computation of weighted mean scores.

The primary data collection tool was a researcher-made survey questionnaire designed to measure preparedness across the five domains of teacher education. To ensure validity and reliability, the instrument underwent a rigorous development process. Content validity was established through expert review by three faculty members specializing in teacher education, curriculum studies, and educational measurement. Their feedback led to revisions in item clarity, alignment with PPST domains, and appropriateness for third-year BEEd students. Construct validity was examined through pilot testing with a comparable group of 20 BEEd students from another campus, ensuring that items accurately reflected the intended domains. Reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha, which yielded coefficients ranging from 0.82 to 0.89 across the five domains, indicating high internal consistency. The final instrument consisted of 35 items rated on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = Not Prepared, 4 = Very Prepared), allowing for nuanced measurement of perceived preparedness. This validation process ensured that the instrument was both psychometrically sound and contextually appropriate for assessing the academic and practical readiness of pre-service teachers.

Data Analysis. Completed questionnaires were checked for accuracy, tabulated, and analyzed through frequency distributions, weighted mean, and ranking to determine overall preparedness and highlight areas of strength and weakness.

RESULTS

The findings from all 63 third-year BEEd students at Aklan State University – Main Campus (AY 2025–2026) are organized into five domains: 1) academic content mastery, 2) instructional delivery, 3) classroom management, 4) instructional materials and 5) technology competence, and 6) intrinsic motivation and 7) teaching readiness. Data are presented in both tabular and textual form, showing weighted mean scores and rankings

that reflect the respondents' preparedness levels across these domains.

Academic Content Mastery. The study revealed that Third-year BEEd students showed overall preparedness in academic content mastery with a mean score of 3.72.

Table 1
Level of Preparedness in Academic Content Mastery

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Demonstrates mastery of fundamental concepts in English, Mathematics, and Science	3.5	Prepared
Understands key principles of child growth and development	3.8	Prepared
Knowledgeable about curriculum standards and learning competencies	3.7	Prepared
Understands major educational theories and their principles	3.6	Prepared
Familiar with different types of assessment and their purposes	3.9	Prepared
Understands subject matter content required in elementary teaching	3.8	Prepared
Identifies appropriate content for specific grade levels	3.8	Prepared
Understands the structure and components of a lesson plan	3.9	Prepared
Knowledgeable about inclusive education principles	3.9	Prepared
Academic coursework provides sufficient theoretical foundation for teaching	3.3	Prepared
Overall Mean	3.72	Prepared

Note. Weighted mean scores were interpreted as follows: 4.50–5.00 = Very Prepared, 3.50–4.49 = Prepared, 2.50–3.49 = Moderately Prepared, 1.50–2.49 = Less Prepared, and 1.00–1.49 = Not Prepared.

Strong indicators included assessment literacy, lesson planning, and inclusive education (all at 3.9), reflecting confidence in evaluating outcomes, structuring lessons, and fostering inclusive classrooms. The lowest rating, theoretical coursework adequacy (3.3), revealed a gap between theory and practice. This concern aligns with Ramos (2026), who linked weak mastery to reduced instructional quality, and Sathasivam et al. (2024), who noted that coursework often fails to translate into classroom application.

Instructional Delivery Skills. Students displayed a high level of preparedness in instructional delivery, with weighted means of 3.7–3.9. The strongest indicators, lesson motivation, clear directions, and active participation (3.9), showed confidence in engaging learners and sustaining lesson flow. The lowest scores (3.7) were in higher-order questioning and abstract concept explanation, highlighting a need for

improvement in promoting critical thinking. This gap is supported by Panganoron-Jabonete (2022), who emphasized communicative tasks for critical thinking, and DeSantis et al. (2023), who found coaching effective in enhancing questioning strategies.

Table 2
Level of Preparedness in Instructional Delivery Skills

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Uses motivation, review, or prior knowledge activation effectively	3.9	Prepared
Provides clear, sequential directions learners can follow	3.9	Prepared
Formulates questions that elicit higher-order thinking	3.7	Prepared
Explains abstract concepts with age-appropriate analogies	3.7	Prepared
Organizes lesson content from simple to complex	3.7	Prepared
Encourages active student participation during delivery	3.9	Prepared
Adjusts explanations when learners show misunderstanding	3.9	Prepared
Designs structured group work or guided practice aligned with objectives	4.1	Prepared
Completes lesson within allotted time	3.9	Prepared
Summarizes key points effectively at lesson conclusion	3.9	Prepared
Overall Mean	3.86	Prepared

Note: Weighted mean scores were classified as follows: 4.50–5.00 = Very Prepared, 3.50–4.49 = Prepared, 2.50–3.49 = Moderately Prepared, 1.50–2.49 = Less Prepared, and 1.00–1.49 = Not Prepared.

Classroom Management Skills. Findings showed that third-year BEEd students were generally prepared in classroom management, with strengths in establishing routines, maintaining discipline, and ensuring safety. The highest ratings were in organizing routines and maintaining order, confirming their ability to create structured environments. Lower ratings in handling disruptive behavior and resolving conflicts highlighted gaps in managing classroom challenges. This aligns with Manajemen Kelas (2022), who emphasized behavioral interventions and communication skills, and Behera (2024), who noted the global prevalence of disruptive behaviors and the need for constructive strategies.

Table 3
Level of Preparedness in Classroom Management Skills

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Establishes clear classroom rules and expectations	4.3	Prepared
Maintains order during classroom activities	3.9	Prepared
Manages disruptive behavior effectively	3.7	Prepared
Keeps students focused on assigned tasks	3.9	Prepared
Ogranizes classroom routines efficiently	3.9	Prepared
Creates a respectful environment that values learner differences	4.4	Prepared
Handles students conflict appropriately	4.0	Prepared
Maintains discipline without disrupting lesson flow	3.8	Prepared
Monitors student behavior consistently	4.0	Prepared
Ensures a safe and orderly learning environment	4.0	Prepared
Overall Mean	3.97	Prepared

Note: Weighted mean scores were classified as follows: 4.50–5.00 = Very Prepared, 3.50–4.49 = Prepared, 2.50–3.49 = Moderately Prepared, 1.50–2.49 = Less Prepared, and 1.00–1.49 = Not Prepared.

Instructional Materials and Technology Competence. Findings showed that third-year BEEd students were prepared in designing and using instructional materials, with strong performance in selecting resources, preparing aids, and using presentation tools. The highest indicators were in material selection and preparation, consistent with Pecson & Sarmiento (2023), who emphasized instructional materials' role in enhancing teaching effectiveness.

Table 4
Level of Preparedness in Instructional Materials and Technology Competence

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Selects instructional materials aligned with lesson objectives	4.3	Prepared
Prepares teaching aids that support lesson content	3.5	Prepared
Designs visual materials that enhance learner understanding	3.9	Prepared
Uses presentation tools such as slides effectively	4.0	Prepared
Operates basic educational technologies confidently	4.0	Prepared
Integrates multimedia (videos, images) into lessons	3.9	Prepared
Adapts materials for diverse learner needs	3.8	Prepared
Organizes and manages instructional resources efficiently	4.1	Prepared
Resolves basic technical issues during instruction	4.0	Prepared
Utilizes available materials even with limited resources	3.8	Prepared
Overall Mean	3.83	Prepared

Note: Weighted mean scores were classified as follows: 4.50–5.00 = Very Prepared, 3.50–4.49 = Prepared, 2.50–3.49 = Moderately Prepared, 1.50–2.49 = Less Prepared, and 1.00–1.49 = Not Prepared.

The lowest ratings were in operating educational technologies and troubleshooting issues, reflecting challenges in seamless technology integration. This mirrors Limbong & Wadham (2024), who noted connectivity and software access problems despite adequate digital competence.

Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness. Findings showed that third-year BEEd students demonstrated a high level of preparedness in intrinsic motivation and teaching readiness.

Table 5
Level of Preparedness in Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Demonstrates intrinsic drive to pursue teaching	4.1	Prepared
Shows personal commitment to becoming effective in the profession	4.0	Prepared
Invests time and effort to improve teaching competencies	3.8	Prepared
Applies knowledge and skills confidently in classroom settings	3.9	Prepared
Handles responsibilities of teaching practice effectively	4.0	Prepared
Accepts challenges and learns from teaching experiences	3.8	Prepared
Improves continuously based on feedback and reflection	3.7	Prepared
Maintains mental preparedness for teaching demands	4.5	Highly Prepared
Takes initiative in performing teaching-related tasks	4.0	Prepared
Exhibits internal drive and readiness for actual teaching	3.9	Prepared
Overall Mean	3.97	Prepared

Note: Weighted mean scores were classified as follows: 4.50–5.00 = Very Prepared, 3.50–4.49 = Prepared, 2.50–3.49 = Moderately Prepared, 1.50–2.49 = Less Prepared, and 1.00–1.49 = Not Prepared.

They expressed strong enthusiasm for teaching, responsibility toward learners, and confidence in managing challenges, with weighted mean scores confirming motivation to perform well in experiential learning. Lower ratings in sustaining motivation under pressure and adapting to unexpected situations indicated the need for support in resilience and stress management.

Preparedness Across Five Categories. This section presents the overall results across five domains of teaching preparedness: Academic Content Mastery, Instructional Delivery Skills, Classroom Management Skills, Instructional Materials and Technology Competence, and

Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness. Analysis of the grand mean and category means highlights both strengths and areas needing improvement, showing how BEEd students' preparedness reflects readiness for professional practice. To provide a holistic view of teaching readiness, the overall mean scores across the five domains, namely; Academic Content Mastery, Instructional Delivery Skills, Classroom Management Skills, Instructional Materials and Technology Competence, and Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness, were computed. This summary highlights the general level of preparedness of BEEd students.

Table 6
Overall Preparedness Across Five Categories

Category	Overall Mean	Interpretation
Academic Content Mastery	3.72	Prepared
Instructional Delivery Skills	3.86	Prepared
Classroom Management Skills	3.97	Prepared
Instructional Materials & Technology Competence	3.83	Prepared
Intrinsic Motivation & Teaching Readiness	3.97	Prepared
Grand Mean	3.87	Prepared

Note: Weighted mean scores were classified as follows: 4.50–5.00 = Very Prepared, 3.50–4.49 = Prepared, 2.50–3.49 = Moderately Prepared, 1.50–2.49 = Less Prepared, and 1.00–1.49 = Not Prepared.

Students were found to be generally prepared across all five domains, with a grand mean of 3.87. The highest preparedness was in Classroom Management Skills and Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness (3.97), showing confidence in maintaining order and sustaining enthusiasm. Instructional Delivery Skills (3.86) and Instructional Materials and Technology Competence (3.83) reflected solid readiness, though with gaps in higher-order questioning and technology integration. The lowest mean was in Academic Content Mastery (3.72), indicating strength in assessment, lesson planning, and inclusive education but weaker ratings in theoretical coursework.

Strengths and Weaknesses in Preparedness as Future Teachers. Understanding strengths and weaknesses in teacher preparedness clarifies readiness for professional practice. Identifying strengths highlights competencies to nurture,

while recognizing weaknesses points to areas needing targeted support and institutional intervention. This balanced view ensures programs both celebrate existing capabilities and address gaps, providing a foundation for continuous improvement toward producing competent, reflective, and adaptable educators.

BEEd students' preparedness varies across domains. In Academic Content Mastery (M=3.72), strengths lie in assessment literacy, lesson planning, and inclusive education, but low ratings in coursework and theoretical foundations suggest theory is perceived as insufficient without practice. Instructional Delivery Skills (M=3.86) show competence in structured activities, clarity, time management, and lesson closure, yet moderate scores in higher-order questioning, abstract explanations, and sequencing complex content highlight challenges in fostering critical thinking.

Classroom Management Skills recorded the highest mean (M=3.97), with strong preparedness in organizing space, routines, and student responsibility, though handling disruptions remains a weakness. In Instructional Materials and Technology Competence (M=3.83), students effectively use rubrics, monitor progress, and provide feedback, but struggle with assessing higher-order thinking, ensuring fairness, and employing varied tools.

Finally, Intrinsic Motivation and Teaching Readiness also scored high (M=3.97), reflecting adaptability through leadership, community participation, and reflective practice. However, lower ratings in mentorship-seeking and pursuit of higher studies indicate a need for institutional support to sustain long-term growth.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study reveal that BEEd students are generally prepared across all five domains of teaching readiness, with a grand mean of 3.87. The highest preparedness was in Classroom Management Skills and Intrinsic

Motivation & Teaching Readiness (M=3.97), reflecting strong confidence in maintaining order, structured environments, and enthusiasm for professional growth. Instructional Delivery Skills (M=3.86) and Instructional Materials & Technology Competence (M=3.83) showed solid preparedness, though challenges remain in higher-order questioning and advanced assessment strategies. The lowest mean was in Academic Content Mastery (M=3.72), indicating confidence in lesson planning and inclusive education but weaker perceptions of theoretical coursework without practical application.

Students' strengths were evident in classroom management, clear lesson delivery, and sustained motivation through leadership and reflection, aligning with best practices in teacher education. Weaknesses appeared in academic content mastery and advanced assessment practice, where confidence in applying theory independently and designing higher-order assessments was limited. This suggests that while students are prepared for practical teaching, they need further support in bridging theoretical foundations with classroom realities.

Implications for Educational Practice. The findings highlight important implications for teacher education programs. Strong preparedness in classroom management and motivation should be reinforced through simulation-based training and leadership opportunities. Weaknesses in academic content mastery and assessment design call for curriculum adjustments that better integrate theory with practice, including enhanced practicum experiences, mentorship, and workshops on higher-order questioning and assessment. Institutions should also provide structured opportunities for research and seminars to foster reflection and professional growth. Addressing these gaps ensures future educators are not only motivated and confident but also academically and pedagogically equipped to meet diverse classroom demands.

Conclusion. The study shows that third-year BEd students are generally well-prepared, with weighted means ranging from 3.72 to 3.97. Strengths were evident in lesson planning, assessment literacy, and inclusive education (M=3.9), reflecting confidence in structured lesson design, while the lowest score in theoretical coursework (M=3.3) highlighted the need to better connect abstract frameworks with classroom realities.

Instructional delivery was strong in motivation, clarity, and engagement (M=3.9), though moderate ratings in higher-order questioning and abstract concept explanation (M=3.7) revealed limited confidence in fostering deeper inquiry. Classroom management recorded the highest preparedness (M=3.97), with competence in routines and order, but weaker ratings in handling disruptions and conflict resolution pointed to gaps in socio-emotional management.

In instructional materials and technology, preparedness was evident in material selection and preparation (≈ 3.9), yet lower scores in technology operation and troubleshooting (M=3.6–3.7) reflected challenges in digital integration. Finally, intrinsic motivation and teaching readiness emerged as the strongest domain (M=3.97), affirming professional commitment and enthusiasm, though slightly lower ratings (M=3.7–3.8) in confidence to face real classroom demands suggested transitional anxieties.

Overall, BEd students are classroom-ready and motivated, but strengthening theoretical integration, higher-level questioning, conflict management, and digital adaptability remains essential to fully prepare them as transformative educators.

Recommendations. Based on the results and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed to strengthen pre-service teacher education and align institutional practices with the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). The findings highlight the need for a holistic approach that integrates academic content

mastery, effective instructional delivery, classroom management competence, assessment literacy, and continuous professional growth. By situating these recommendations within the PPST domains, institutions can ensure that teacher preparation programs are not only responsive to contemporary educational challenges but also anchored in evidence-based practices that foster resilience, adaptability, and lifelong learning among future educators.

Academic Content Mastery. Institutions should expand practice-based learning through micro-demonstrations, simulations, and field immersion to bridge theory with classroom realities. Curriculum alignment workshops and subject-specific enrichment in English, Math, and Science will further strengthen core content mastery. These initiatives align with PPST Domain 1 (Content Knowledge and Pedagogy), which underscores subject matter expertise as the foundation of effective teaching.

Instructional Delivery Skills. Training programs should emphasize inquiry-based strategies, advanced questioning, and learner-centered approaches. Workshops, peer teaching, and collaborative lesson planning can strengthen communication skills and confidence in fostering critical and creative thinking. Promoting inclusive and adaptive pedagogy ensures equitable learning environments, aligned with PPST Domain 3 (Diversity of Learners).

Classroom Management. Institutions should implement simulation-based training, mentoring, and structured classroom exposure to prepare pre-service teachers for managing disruptions, discipline, and diverse behaviors. Role-playing real scenarios builds decision-making and resilience, while continuous reflective practice reinforces long-term classroom management competence, aligned with PPST Domain 4 (Curriculum and Planning).

Assessment and Evaluation Skills. The curriculum should integrate workshops on

authentic assessment design, equipping pre-service teachers to create fair, inclusive, and meaningful tools that measure higher-order thinking. Strengthening assessment literacy ensures effective evaluation of learning outcomes, aligned with PPST Domain 5 (Assessment and Reporting).

Professional Growth and Development.

Institutions should establish mentorship programs, promote reflective practice, and provide access to seminars, trainings, and advanced studies. Embedding continuous professional development pathways fosters adaptability to reforms and innovations, aligned with PPST Domain 7 (Personal Growth and Professional Development), which emphasizes lifelong learning.

Author contributions. Jericho Andrew N. Paunillo: Conceptualization and Formal Analysis - Took the lead in the conceptualization of the whole paper, ensuring that the research problem, objectives, and scope were clearly defined. He is also in charge of the computation of results after data gathering and was primarily responsible for the analysis and interpretation of findings, ensuring that the statistical outputs were accurately processed and meaningfully explained in relation to the study's objectives. | Jonah Eliza Prado-Tordecillas: Supervision - Provided guidance, supervision, and expert validation throughout the research process, ensuring that the study met institutional and scholarly requirements. | Darlyn Grace A. Tolentino: Writing-original draft - Focused on writing the Introduction and Review of Related Literature, establishing the conceptual and theoretical foundation of the study. She also assisted in the data collection process and ensured that ethical protocols were observed. | Genesis Wesley N. Paunillo: Data Curation - Was responsible for gathering the data from respondents, ensuring accuracy and completeness of survey administration. He also contributed to the organization of responses for analysis. | Trishtan B. Apostol: Writing review and editing - Handled the securing of approval letters and other formal requirements, and took charge of the formatting

of the manuscript, ensuring clarity, coherence, and adherence to academic standards.

Conflict of interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Funding source. This research received no external funding.

Artificial intelligence use. AI-assisted language editing was performed using Microsoft Copilot; authors reviewed and approved all content.

Ethics approval statement. This study involved human respondents; however, formal ethical approval was not sought from the authors' institution. The authors affirm that participation was voluntary, informed consent was obtained, and confidentiality of responses was strictly maintained. No procedures were undertaken that posed risk or harm to the participants.

Data availability statement. All data supporting the findings of this study are included within the manuscript and its supplementary materials.

Acknowledgement. (Not available)

Publisher's disclaimer. The views expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the publisher. The publisher disclaims any responsibility for errors or omissions.

REFERENCES

- Abuloc, M. B., & Limpot, M. Y. (2026). Students' learning motivation in Filipino, readiness for blended learning, and self-efficacy: A structural equation model of effective teaching strategies among pre-service students. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 52(3), 68-82. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2026/v52i32892>
- Aquino, A. M. (2022). Transforming paranoia to metanoia: How does teaching look like vis-à-vis experiential learning? *International Journal of Education*

- Humanities and Social Science*, 5(1), 125–139.
<https://doi.org/10.54922/IJEHSS.2022.0350>
- Barseghyan, L., & Hovakimyan, L. (2024). Igniting curiosity and critical thinking: The impact of higher-order questions in EFL class. *Foreign Languages in Higher Education*, 28(1), 170–185.
<https://doi.org/10.46991/FLHE/2024.28.1.170>
- Behera, G. (2024). Classroom discipline, emerging concerns and research priority. *Journal of Emerging New Generation Pedagogical Issues*, 5(1), 45–56.
<https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.5.0224.0612>
- Bilbao, P. P., Torno, B. G., & Lucido, P. I. (2010). Enhancement of teacher competencies through experiential learning courses: Implications to the pre-service teacher education curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 1(1), 117–138.
<https://doi.org/10.70997/2546-1796.1066>
- Bilim, I. (2014). Pre-service elementary teachers' motivations to become a teacher and its relationship with teaching self-efficacy. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 141, 653–661.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.25816>
- Burac, R. B., Jr. (2020). A critical review on the implementation of experiential learning courses. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(1), 121–128.
- Cabral, H. S. (2022). Implementation of the experiential learning courses of the College of Teacher Education and Arts and Sciences. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Innovation*, 1(3), 37–42.
<https://doi.org/10.54536/ajmri.v1i3.286>
- Calavia, M. B., Blanco, T., Casas, R., & Dieste, B. (2022). Making design thinking for education sustainable: Training preservice teachers to address practice challenges. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 108, 101199.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2022.101199>
- DeSantis, W. J., Delcourt, M. A. B., Shore, B. M., & Greenwood, J. C. (2023). Impact of data-driven feedback and coaching on preservice teachers' questioning skills for higher-order thinking within a mixed-reality simulation environment. *Education Sciences*, 13(6), 596.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13060596>
- DeSantis, J., et al. (2023). Data-driven feedback and coaching in mixed-reality simulations: Effects on higher-order questioning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 124, 103927.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.103927>
- Kucukakin, P., & Göloğlu Demir, C. (2021). The relationship between classroom management and students' learning: A systematic review. *Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi SBE Dergisi*, 11(2), 843–861.
<https://doi.org/10.30783/nevsosbilen.894503>
- Favor, C. C. (2026). Preparing environmentally responsive teachers: Ecological literacy of preservice teachers in a climate-vulnerable coastal community. *Journal of Pedagogical Studies in Education*, 7(2), 38–47.
<https://doi.org/10.46809/jpse.v7i2.163>
- Giacomazzi, M., Serwanga, E., & Atuheire, G. (2023). Transforming teachers' instructional design for enhancing critical thinking in Ugandan schools: Assessment through rubric. *Global Journal of Social Development*, 3(1), 15–39.
<https://doi.org/10.52398/gjsd.2023.v3.i1.p15-39>

- Hasnanto, A. (2024). Effective classroom management to create a positive learning environment. *Journal of Classroom Education and Learning*, 4(1), 257–268.
<https://doi.org/10.54012/jcell.v4i001.388>
- Heretape, E. H. (2023). Bachelor of elementary education (BEED) students' readiness for practice teaching: Basis for enhancement training plan. *International Journal of Social Science and Management Review*, 6(12), 20–31.
<https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2023.61202>
- Hermansyah, H., Hartono, R., Haryanti, R. P., & Wahyuni, S. (2023). Leveraging questioning techniques to foster students' cognitive and metacognitive development. *Media Indonesia*, 30(2).
<https://doi.org/10.23887/mi.v30i02.103672>
- Hermansyah, H., et al. (2023). Reflective questioning and cognitive development in classroom practice. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(2), 311–326.
<https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16217a>
- Huang, J., Sang, G., & He, W. (2023). Motivation to teach and preparedness for teaching among preservice teachers in China: The effect of conscientiousness and constructivist teaching beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1116321.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1116321>
- Limbong, E., & Wadham, B. (2024). Exploring pre-service English teachers' digital competence in creating interactive instructional materials. *Studies in English Language Education*, 11(2), 351–370.
<https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i2.35103>
- Lopez, N. L., & Irene, E. A. (2017). Motivation and commitment to teaching among pre-service teachers of a state university in Samar, Philippines. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 8(3).
- Manajemen kelas: Definisi, tujuan, kegiatan dan indikator keberhasilannya. (2021). Buana Kata, 1(2), 117–126.
<https://doi.org/10.23960/buanakata.v1i2.558>
- Matjašič, M., & Vogrinc, J. (2024). Research competence of pre-service teachers: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 13(2), 877–894.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-er.13.2.877>
- Palacios, N., & Reedy, A. K. (2024). Teaching practicums as an ideal setting for the development of teachers-in-training. *Revista de Investigación en Formación del Profesorado*, 97(36).
<https://doi.org/10.47553/rifop.v97i36.1.89267>
- Panganoron-Jabonete, N. (2022). Instructional strategies and integration of critical thinking skills of preservice English teachers. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 4(3), 114–119.
<https://doi.org/10.32996/jeltal.2022.4.3.10>
- Pecore, J. L., Nagle, C., Welty, T., Kim, M., & Demetrikopoulos, M. (2022). Science teacher candidates' questioning and discussion skill performance in a virtual simulation using experiential deliberate practice. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 33(5), 415–435.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2022.2111775>
- Pecore, J. L., Serwanga, E., & Atuheire, G. (2022). Experiential deliberate practice in virtual simulations for science teacher candidates. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 33(5), 543–560.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2022.2045678>

- Pecson, R. R., & Sarmiento, J. R. (2023). Student teaching and instructional materials in the 21st-century classroom: A literature review. *International Journal of Teaching and Instructional Studies*, 5(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijotis.v5i1.82628>
- Prihatin, A. Y., Arcana, I. N., & Kusumaningrum, B. (2023). Development of trigonometric comparison teaching materials based on ICT and Tri-N for face-to-face and distance learning. *Union Journal of Education*, 12(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.30738/union.v12i1.16964>
- Rahmadani, R., Neviyarni, N., & Nirwana, H. (2023). Developing student abilities through classroom management: Principles, components and role of the teacher. *Manajia Journal*, 2(1), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.58355/manajia.v2i1.33>
- Ramos, T. M. M. (2026). Pre-service elementary teachers' mathematical content knowledge as basis for proposed action plans. Common Ground Publishing – *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy*. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7963/CGP/A271>
- Rasyid, F., Aini, N., & Varghesse, K. J. (2022). Questioning strategy that works to foster critical thinking skills: A study in Islamic university. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.30762/jeels.v10i2.1048>
- Raihanah, D., Putri, N. M., Fatmawati, T. K., & Nurjayadi, M. (2024). Pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) ability for prospective chemistry teacher students and chemistry teachers: A literature review. *Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.29303/jpm.v19i1.6395>
- Rif'atullah, M., & Ciptaningrum, D. S. (2024). Exploring pre-service teacher professional learning on their preparedness for teaching practicum. *Frontiers in Social Research*, 3(8), 1779–1798. <https://doi.org/10.55927/fjsr.v3i8.10969>
- Robinos, J. R., Roxas, M. J., Villalona, C., Alipasa, C. D., & Reyes, K. N. (2025). Equipped to educate: Exploring work readiness of graduating teacher education students. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 10, 145–155. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.504>
- Sasson, I., & Tifferet, S. (2024). Enhancing undergraduate metacognitive awareness and self-efficacy: Effective instructional practices for research question formulation. *European Journal of Education*, 59(1), e12888. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12888>
- Sathasivam, R. V., Abdullah, M. N. S., & Abd Rauf, R. A. (2024). Theory-practice divide: Pre-service teachers' application of pedagogical knowledge during teaching practicum. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 32(1), 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.32.1.04>
- Sebastian, M. A., & Villa, E. A. (2026). Teaching preparedness, demographic, and academic factors on teaching competencies: A structural equation modelling approach. *International Journal of Special Education*, 41(1), 79–103. <https://doi.org/10.46328/ijses.123>
- Segumpan, S. M., Tac-an, T. N., Tidal, A.-M., Trasmonte, C., & Mahinay, R. B. (2025). Licensure exam for teachers (LET) elementary and secondary performance: Implications for teacher preparation. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.551>
- Suarez, V. E., Rivera, M. J. D., Nicolas, C. J., Sicmaten, Z. J. C., Dimalibot, A. A. L., & Jr, O. O. A. (2026). Building confidence, battling anxiety: A closer look at BEED and BECED pre-service teachers.

- International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 10(3), 3555–3576.
<https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100300266>
- Tan, C., & Rodriguez, M. T. (2016). Readiness and preparation of pre-service teachers on the K to 12 program. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(12), 13–19.
- Tang, S. Y. F., Wong, A. K. Y., & Cheng, M. M. H. (2015). The preparation of highly motivated and professionally competent teachers in initial teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 41(2), 128–144.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2015.1010875>
- Umara, A. M., Pardjono, P., & Pratama, G. N. I. P. (2024). Analysis of the indirect correlation between academic achievement, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, and self-efficacy on teaching readiness. *Jurnal Pendidikan Vokasi*, 14(1), 29–42.
<https://doi.org/10.21831/jpv.v14i1.59766>
- UNESCO. (2023). *UNESCO Publishing*.
<https://doi.org/10.54675/WIHC1394>
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations Publishing.
<https://doi.org/10.18356/9789213584203>
- Uysal, D. (2023). A review on teachers' and teacher candidates' intrinsic motivation: Self-determination theory perspective. *Later Journal*, 2(2), 176–198.
<https://doi.org/10.35207/late.1331081>
- Winget, M., & Persky, A. M. (2022). A practical review of mastery learning. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 86(10), Article ajpe8906.
<https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8906>
- Yasin, B., Mustafa, F., & Bina, A. M. S. (2022). Effective classroom management in English as a foreign language classroom. *Parole: Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 12(1), 91–102.
<https://doi.org/10.14710/parole.v12i1.91-102>