ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

PERCEIVED TEACHING READINESS OF FOURTH-YEAR EDUCATION STUDENTS: BASIS FOR A TEACHER PREPARATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

Rose A. Arganda[1], Armen R. Cabatuan[2], Rose Angela P. Mengote[3], James Vincent Moscosa[4], Mary Joy R. Rapada[5], Jean Rose A. Yape[6]
College of Education, Eastern Samar State University–Can-Avid Campus, Can-avid, Eastern Samar, Philippines

ABSTRACT
Readiness for practice teaching is a central concern in teacher education, yet local evidence on how fourth-year students perceive their preparedness before field immersion remains limited. This study determined the perceived pre-service teaching readiness of fourth-year College of Education students at Eastern Samar State University–Can-Avid Campus in terms of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, and examined its relationship with sex, age, and General Weighted Average (GWA). A descriptive-correlational design was employed with 137 respondents selected through total enumeration. Data were gathered using a validated, researcher-made, five-point Likert questionnaire and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and Pearson's r at the 0.05 level of significance. Respondents were predominantly female (69.34%) and aged 20–22 years (61.31%), with a mean GWA of 1.86 (SD = 0.24). Overall readiness was very high (M = 4.65), with Attitudes rated highest (M = 4.70) and openness to new teaching strategies the top indicator (M = 4.77). Technology integration (M = 4.56) and learner motivation (M = 4.56) were rated lowest. Sex (p = 0.610) and age (r = 0.084, p = 0.328) were not significantly related to readiness, whereas GWA showed a significant moderate negative relationship (r = −0.342, p = 0.0001), indicating higher readiness among students with better academic standing. Teacher education programs should sustain academic preparation while strengthening technology integration, learner motivation, and guided classroom practice through a Teacher Preparation Enhancement Program.

KEYWORDS: *Pre-Service Teaching Readiness; Teacher Education; Knowledge, Skills, Values, And Attitudes; General Weighted Average; Teacher Preparation Enhancement Program*

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Education is essential to individual lives and national development, and at the heart of every successful education system are qualified teachers who possess the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes needed to promote meaningful learning. Given the demands of 21st-century education, teacher education institutions are expected to ensure that graduates are prepared for the profession before they enter actual classrooms. Pre-service teaching is a critical stage of this preparation: student teachers apply the theory and professional skills acquired in college while learning from cooperating teachers and college supervisors, and develop confidence, competence, and professional responsibility.

In the Philippines, the Commission on Higher Education and the Department of Education emphasize outcomes-based and competency-based teacher education so that graduates meet the expectations set by the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST). Even so, student teachers continue to face challenges in the transition from college-based learning to real classrooms, including classroom management, instructional delivery, communication with learners, student assessment, and responding to diverse learning needs. Mahinay et al. (2024) reported that fourth-year education students showed good preparedness in knowledge, teaching skills, professional values, and attitudes, yet still needed support in classroom management, instructional decision-making, and addressing diverse learners.

Technology integration has added new expectations for future teachers. Lausa et al. (2024) found that exposure to information and communication technology resources enhances the instructional readiness and confidence of pre-service teachers, underscoring the value of digital instructional resources in teacher preparation. Readiness is also shaped by academic preparation, mentoring, field experiences, self-confidence, and communication skills; Norman and Cal (2024) found that mentoring and teaching experiences play significant roles in the professional growth and competence of student teachers.

Locally, previous studies have largely examined teaching performance after internship rather than readiness before practice teaching, and few have asked whether sex, age, and academic performance are associated with perceived readiness in terms of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes. To address these gaps, this study assessed the perceived pre-service teaching readiness of fourth-year College of Education students at Eastern Samar State University before they began practice teaching. The findings may serve as empirical evidence for improving curriculum, teaching strategies, and mentoring, and as a basis for a Teacher Preparation Enhancement Program. The study is anchored on Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory, which explains how future teachers develop readiness by observing and modeling mentors, cooperating teachers, peers, and classroom practices.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the pre-service teaching readiness of fourth-year College of Education students at Eastern Samar State University as a basis for a Teacher Preparation Enhancement Program. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the demographic and academic profile of the respondents in terms of:
   Sex,
   Age, and
   General Weighted Average (GWA)?
2. What is the level of pre-service teaching readiness of the respondents in terms of:
   2.1 Knowledge,
   2.2 Skills,
   2.3 Values, and
   2.4 Attitudes?
3. Is there a significant relationship between the respondents' profile and their level of perceived pre-service teaching readiness?

The null hypothesis (H_0) stated that there is no significant relationship between the respondents' demographic and academic profile and their level of pre-service teaching readiness in terms of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

A descriptive-correlational research design was employed. The descriptive component described the level of readiness of fourth-year Education students in knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes as it naturally existed, without manipulation of variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). The correlational component examined whether sex, age, and academic performance were significantly related to readiness without establishing cause and effect.

Locale of the Study

The study was conducted at the College of Education of Eastern Samar State University–Can-Avid Campus, Can-avid, Eastern Samar, a state higher education institution offering undergraduate and graduate programs in teacher education. Fourth-year students undergo field study courses and pre-service teaching to develop the competencies expected of beginning teachers. The locale was selected because it was the institution where the respondents were enrolled and would undertake their pre-service teaching, during Academic Year 2026–2027.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents were the 137 fourth-year College of Education students officially enrolled during Academic Year 2026–2027 who were preparing for practice teaching. Total enumeration sampling was used because the target population was small and manageable. The researchers, students not officially enrolled as fourth-year students, those who did not give informed consent, and those who submitted incomplete questionnaires were excluded to minimize bias and protect data quality.

Research Instruments

A researcher-made questionnaire of two parts was used. Part I gathered the respondents' sex, age, and GWA. Part II comprised 30 items measuring readiness in knowledge (8 items), skills (8 items), values (7 items), and attitudes (7 items), rated on a five-point Likert scale from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). The instrument was content-validated by three experts (the research adviser and two faculty members specializing in educational research, teacher education, and instrument development) and was pilot-tested with 10 third-year Education students who were not part of the final sample. Reliability was determined using Cronbach's alpha, with a coefficient of 0.70 or higher considered acceptable. The pilot test yielded an overall composite mean of 4.68 (SD = 0.50), interpreted as Very High Readiness. Responses were interpreted using the scale in Table M1.

Table M1. Interpretation scale

Scale	Range	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.21–5.00	Strongly Agree (Very High Readiness)
4	3.41–4.20	Agree
3	2.61–3.40	Neutral
2	1.81–2.60	Disagree
1	1.00–1.80	Strongly Disagree

Data Gathering

Permission was first secured from the Dean of the College of Education, and the schedule of administration was coordinated with the program chair and class advisers. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, the nature of their participation, and their rights, and only those who voluntarily signed the informed consent form were included. The questionnaires were personally administered by the researchers, who explained the instructions. Sex, age, and GWA were self-reported, with respondents encouraged to consult their official grades. Accomplished forms were immediately collected, checked for completeness, encoded, and tabulated.

Analysis of Data

Frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation were used to describe the profile of the respondents. GWA was interpreted using the university grading system, in which 1.00 is the highest grade (95–100, Excellent) and 5.00 indicates failure. The GWA for General Education, Professional Education, and Major courses was computed separately as $\Sigma(\text{grade} \times \text{credit units}) / \Sigma(\text{credit units})$. The weighted mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

readiness. Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient was used to test the relationship between sex and readiness, and Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient (r) was used to test the relationships of age and GWA with readiness. The level of significance was set at 0.05, and the null hypothesis was rejected when $p < 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations

Participation was entirely voluntary, and respondents were informed of their right to refuse or withdraw at any time without negative consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained: names and identifying information were not collected, data were used solely for academic purposes, and completed questionnaires were stored securely. Findings were reported honestly and all sources were acknowledged. The study was granted an ethics certificate for completed research by the university's Research Ethics Committee (Certificate No. ESSUC-REC-2026-099, issued September 30, 2026).

RESULTS

Demographic and Academic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1. Distribution of respondents by sex

Sex	Frequency	Percentage
Female	95	69.34%
Male	42	30.66%
Total	**137**	**100.00%**

As shown in Table 1, females constituted the clear majority of the 137 respondents (f = 95, 69.34%), while males numbered 42 (30.66%). This distribution aligns with broader trends in teacher education, where female pre-service teachers typically outnumber male candidates.

Table 2. Distribution of respondents by age

Age	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD
20–22 years old	84	61.31%	22.72	2.59
23–25 years old	44	32.12%		
26–28 years old	4	2.92%		
29 years old and above	5	3.65%		
Total	**137**	**100.00%**		

Most respondents were aged 20–22 years (f = 84, 61.31%), followed by those aged 23–25 years (f = 44, 32.12%). A small proportion were aged 26–28 years (f = 4, 2.92%) or 29 years and above (f = 5, 3.65%). The mean age was 22.72 years (SD = 2.59), indicating that the respondents formed a fairly homogeneous cohort of young adults, with a few older students extending the upper range.

Table 3. Distribution of respondents by academic program

Program	Frequency	Percentage
BSEd – Social Studies	40	29.20%
BSEd – Science	40	29.20%
Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED)	38	27.74%
BSEd – Mathematics	19	13.87%
Total	**137**	**100.00%**

Table 3 shows that the respondents were almost evenly distributed across the Social Studies and Science majors (f = 40 each, 29.20%) and BEED (f = 38, 27.74%), while BSEd–Mathematics had the fewest (f = 19, 13.87%). The sample therefore represented both secondary and elementary teacher preparation tracks.

Table 4. Distribution of respondents by General Weighted Average (GWA)

GWA Range	Frequency	Percentage	Mean	SD	Descriptive Rating
1.00–1.25	8	5.84%	1.86	0.24	Excellent
1.26–1.75	43	31.39%			Very Good
1.76–2.25	82	59.85%			Good
2.26–2.75	4	2.92%			Satisfactory
2.76–3.00	0	0.00%			Fair/Passing
5.00	0	0.00%			Failed
Total	**137**	**100.00%**	**1.86**	**0.24**	**Good**

Most respondents (f = 82, 59.85%) had a GWA of 1.76–2.25 (Good), followed by 43 (31.39%) rated Very Good and 8 (5.84%) rated Excellent. Only four respondents (2.92%) were Satisfactory, and none fell in the Fair/Passing or Failed categories. The mean GWA of 1.86 (SD = 0.24) corresponds to

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

a Good rating, indicating generally sound academic standing among the respondents.

Level of Pre-Service Teaching Readiness

Table 5. Summary of readiness by domain

Domain	No. of Items	Grand Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation	Qualitative Description
Knowledge	8	4.62	0.044	Strongly Agree	Very High Readiness
Skills	8	4.62	0.041	Strongly Agree	Very High Readiness
Values	7	4.65	0.028	Strongly Agree	Very High Readiness
Attitudes	7	4.70	0.044	Strongly Agree	Very High Readiness
Overall Composite	**30**	**4.65**	**0.050**	**Strongly Agree**	**Very High Readiness**

All four domains were rated Strongly Agree, giving an overall composite mean of 4.65 (Very High Readiness). Attitudes obtained the highest mean (4.70), followed by Values (4.65), while Knowledge and Skills tied at 4.62. The narrow spread across domains indicates that respondents felt consistently prepared in every area. Item-level results follow.

Knowledge

Table 5a. Readiness in terms of knowledge

Rank	Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	I understand the objectives of the education curriculum.	4.70	0.57	Strongly Agree
2	I can prepare a lesson plan following the required format.	4.65	0.59	Strongly Agree
3.5	I understand different teaching strategies used in classrooms.	4.63	0.60	Strongly Agree
3.5	I know how to assess learners using appropriate assessment tools.	4.63	0.58	Strongly Agree
5	I understand child growth and development principles.	4.62	0.60	Strongly Agree
6	I know the basic principles of classroom management.	4.61	0.61	Strongly Agree
7	I understand the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST).	4.57	0.60	Strongly Agree
8	I know how to integrate technology into classroom instruction.	4.56	0.62	Strongly Agree

The respondents showed strong theoretical grounding across all Knowledge indicators. Understanding the objectives of the education curriculum ranked highest (M = 4.70, SD = 0.57), suggesting clear comprehension of curriculum standards and learning competencies, followed by lesson planning (M = 4.65, SD = 0.59). Knowledge of teaching strategies and assessment tied for third (M = 4.63), while child development (M = 4.62), classroom management principles (M = 4.61), and the PPST (M = 4.57) followed. Technology integration was lowest (M = 4.56, SD = 0.62), although still Strongly Agree. These results parallel Lomeda-Junio (2025), who reported high cognitive readiness in curriculum design and assessment, and are consistent with the OECD (2023) view that curriculum knowledge enables structured, coherent instruction. The comparatively lower technology item reflects a common gap between theoretical knowledge and digital application; as Sicat et al. (2025) noted, strengthening technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) requires continuous exposure to digital tools during preparation.

Skills

Table 5b. Readiness in terms of skills

Rank	Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
2	I can communicate my ideas clearly during teaching.	4.66	0.62	Strongly Agree
2	I can prepare instructional materials suited to the lesson.	4.66	0.62	Strongly Agree
2	I can evaluate students' learning using different assessment methods.	4.66	0.67	Strongly Agree
4	I can adapt my teaching strategies to meet learners' needs.	4.62	0.63	Strongly Agree
5	I can provide appropriate feedback to learners.	4.60	0.64	Strongly Agree
6	I can manage classroom activities efficiently.	4.59	0.65	Strongly Agree
7	I can use educational technology effectively during instruction.	4.57	0.68	Strongly Agree
8	I can motivate learners to participate in classroom discussions.	4.56	0.65	Strongly Agree

Three indicators tied for the highest rank (M = 4.66): clear communication, preparation of instructional materials, and evaluation of learning through varied assessment methods, showing high proficiency in oral communication, material preparation, and assessment. Adapting strategies to learners' needs followed (M = 4.62, SD = 0.63), then giving feedback (M = 4.60), managing classroom activities (M = 4.59), and using educational technology (M = 4.57). Motivating learners to

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

participate was lowest (M = 4.56, SD = 0.65). The strong communication, materials, and assessment skills align with Mahinay et al. (2024), who found high technical skill readiness among senior education students before immersion. The lower relative standing of motivation and classroom dynamics reflects the real-world complexity of teaching; Ludecke and Cooper (2023) noted that novice teachers often struggle to sustain engagement and manage unpredictable behavior. From the standpoint of Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), such execution gaps may be narrowed through observation, coaching, and modeling by cooperating teachers.

Values

Table 5c. Readiness in terms of values

Rank	Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	I observe ethical standards expected of future teachers.	4.69	0.59	Strongly Agree
2	I respect the opinions and backgrounds of others.	4.68	0.60	Strongly Agree
3.5	I value teamwork and cooperation during school activities.	4.66	0.62	Strongly Agree
3.5	I perform my responsibilities with dedication and commitment.	4.66	0.64	Strongly Agree
5	I demonstrate honesty in accomplishing my academic responsibilities.	4.64	0.61	Strongly Agree
6.5	I show professionalism in my actions and decisions.	4.62	0.66	Strongly Agree
6.5	I accept constructive criticism positively.	4.62	0.62	Strongly Agree

Observing the ethical standards expected of future teachers ranked highest (M = 4.69, SD = 0.59), signaling a strong commitment to the Code of Ethics for Professional Teachers, followed by respect for the opinions and backgrounds of others (M = 4.68), which reflects readiness to foster inclusive environments. Teamwork and dedication tied for third (M = 4.66), followed by honesty (M = 4.64), while professionalism and acceptance of constructive criticism tied at 4.62. The uniformly high ratings indicate strong professional ethics and personal integrity, consistent with Vallente et al. (2025), who found strong ethical grounding aligned with PPST Domain 7 (Personal Growth and Professional Development). UNESCO (2024) likewise identifies ethical conduct, openness to criticism, and respect for diversity as foundations of safe, collaborative, and equitable schools.

Attitudes

Table 5d. Readiness in terms of attitudes

Rank	Indicator	Mean	SD	Interpretation
1	I am open to new teaching strategies and innovations.	4.77	0.54	Strongly Agree
2.5	I enjoy working with children and helping them learn.	4.72	0.61	Strongly Agree
2.5	I am committed to becoming an effective and responsible teacher.	4.72	0.57	Strongly Agree
4	I am willing to learn from my cooperating teacher and supervisors.	4.71	0.60	Strongly Agree
5.5	I am confident in handling classroom teaching responsibilities.	4.66	0.62	Strongly Agree
5.5	I believe I am ready to begin my pre-service teaching experience.	4.66	0.66	Strongly Agree
7	I remain positive even when teaching becomes challenging.	4.65	0.61	Strongly Agree

Openness to new teaching strategies and innovations obtained the highest mean in the entire survey (M = 4.77, SD = 0.54), indicating exceptional willingness to adopt contemporary methods. Enjoying work with children and commitment to becoming an effective teacher tied for second (M = 4.72), followed by willingness to learn from cooperating teachers and supervisors (M = 4.71). Confidence in handling classroom responsibilities and the belief of being ready for pre-service teaching tied at 4.66, while remaining positive amid challenges was lowest (M = 4.65). This proactive mindset is consistent with Estipona (2025), who noted that positive professional attitudes and receptivity to supervisory feedback enhance resilience and instructional growth during internship. Overall, the composite mean of 4.65 (SD = 0.61) across the 30 indicators confirms a Very High level of pre-service teaching readiness.

Relationship Between the Profile and the Level of Pre-Service Teaching Readiness

Table 6. Relationship between respondents' profile and readiness (α = 0.05)

Profile Variable	N	Coefficient	p-value	Decision on H_0	Strength	Interpretation
Sex (Spearman's ρ)	137	0.044	0.610	Failed to reject	Negligible	Not significant
Age (Pearson's r)	137	0.084	0.328	Failed to reject	Very weak positive	Not significant
GWA (Pearson's r)	137	−0.342	0.0001	Rejected	Moderate negative	Significant

Readiness means by sex: female (n = 95) M = 4.67, SD = 0.60; male (n = 42) M = 4.61, SD = 0.63; combined M = 4.65, SD = 0.61.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

Sex. Female respondents recorded a slightly higher mean readiness (M = 4.67, SD = 0.60) than male respondents (M = 4.61, SD = 0.63). However, the p-value of 0.610 exceeded the 0.05 level ($p > 0.05$), so the null hypothesis was not rejected: there was no statistically significant difference in readiness between male and female student teachers. Sex thus does not appear to determine cognitive, pedagogical, or emotional preparation before internship, consistent with Estubio and Sarsale (2024), who observed that gender does not produce significant variation in knowledge, skills, and attitudes under standardized teacher-education curricula. Both groups receive equivalent training and field preparation.

Age. The correlation between age and readiness was very weak and not significant ($r = 0.084$, $p = 0.328$), so the null hypothesis was not rejected. Age did not meaningfully correlate with how prepared respondents felt across knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes. This agrees with Mahinay et al. (2024), who found that chronological age among graduating education students does not significantly dictate instructional competence or self-efficacy. Because most respondents belonged to a tight developmental cohort, readiness appears to be shaped by academic preparation and practical coursework rather than age.

General Weighted Average. GWA showed a statistically significant moderate negative relationship with readiness ($r = -0.342$, $p = 0.0001$; $p < 0.05$), so the null hypothesis was rejected. Because lower numerical GWAs represent higher scholastic standing in the Philippine grading scale, the negative coefficient means that students with better academic performance reported significantly higher readiness. This supports Vallente et al. (2025), who showed that strong academic achievement reinforces pedagogical content mastery and teaching confidence. Stronger academic mastery likely gives student teachers the theoretical grounding to feel competent in designing lesson plans, applying assessments, and executing instructional strategies. As Entero and Comeros (2025) cautioned, however, academic achievement should not be viewed as the sole basis of readiness.

CONCLUSIONS

The fourth-year Education students perceived themselves as having a very high level of pre-service teaching readiness (overall M = 4.65), with high ratings in all four domains and the strongest in attitudes, particularly openness to innovation. Technology integration and motivating learners were rated comparatively lower, indicating that confidence in theory has not yet fully translated into confidence in classroom application. Sex and age were not significantly related to readiness, suggesting that a standardized teacher education curriculum provides comparable preparation regardless of these characteristics, whereas better academic standing (lower GWA) was significantly associated with higher readiness.

The broader pedagogical implication is that strong readiness does not mean preparation should stop. Academic preparation remains an important foundation, but pre-service teachers also need repeated opportunities to practice, receive guidance, reflect, and try again, especially in technology integration, learner motivation, classroom application, and the use of feedback. A Teacher Preparation Enhancement Program built around these needs can help bridge the gap between what students learn at the university and what they are expected to do in their own classrooms.

Recommendations

1. **College of Education / the university.** Provide more opportunities to practice before the formal pre-service experience through regular microteaching, demonstration teaching, classroom simulations, and peer teaching, and adopt the Teacher Preparation Enhancement Program.
2. **Faculty members.** Give added attention to technology integration and learner motivation by replacing discussion-only instruction with actual tasks, such as preparing digital learning materials and conducting technology-supported lessons, and by practicing questioning techniques, group activities, and interactive discussions.
3. **Cooperating teachers and supervisors.** Continue providing regular guidance and constructive feedback, including short discussions before and after lessons rather than only after teaching demonstrations.
4. **Future researchers.** Extend the study to other campuses and year levels, include factors not covered here (e.g., teaching self-efficacy, motivation, institutional resources), and complement self-reported readiness with observed teaching performance during and after practice teaching.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.
The study was approved by the university's Research Ethics Committee (Certificate No. ESSUC-REC-2026-099). All respondents gave voluntary, informed consent.

REFERENCES

1. *Bayog, M. E., Miranda, A., Silvano, J., Olid, Y. J., Severo, P., Libosada, C. J., & Mentang, B. (2022). Online Learning Readiness of Graduating Pre-Service Teachers. https://www.ejournals.ph/article.php?id=20920*
2. *Estubio, M., & Sarsale, M. (2024). Exploring the Preparedness and Competence Level of Pre-service TVET Teachers Using Knowledge, Skills, and Attitude Model. Journal of Technical Education and Training, 16(3), 201–215. https://publisher.uthm.edu.my/ojs/index.php/JTET/article/view/16805*
3. *Lomeda-Junio, M. M. (2025). Readiness of Bachelor of Technical-Vocational Teacher Education pre-service teachers of Camarines Sur Polytechnic Colleges. https://rajournals.com/index.php/raj/article/view/504*
4. *Ludecke, T., & Cooper, G. (2023). Teacher preparedness and classroom readiness among pre-service teachers. https://link.springer.com*
5. *Mahinay, R. M., et al. (2024). Pre-service teaching readiness among fourth-year education students. https://www.ejournals.ph*
6. *Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2023). Teachers and Teaching through the OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS). https://www.oecd.org/education/talis/*
7. *Sicat, A. R., et al. (2025). Pre-service teachers' technological pedagogical and content knowledge (TPACK): Their readiness for online instruction. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1459417*

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 12| Issue: 10| October 2026|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2026: 8.753 || ISI Value: 1.188

8. *Sicat, A. R., Manese, A. F. T., Mendoza, A. F. T., et al. (2025). Pre-service Teachers' Technological Pedagogical and Content Knowledge (TPACK): Their Readiness for Online Instruction. Educational Research and Evaluation, 30(1–2), 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2024.2422996*
9. *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2024). Global education monitoring report: Teacher capacity and quality education. https://www.unesco.org*
10. *Vallente, J. J., Macalong, J. P., Gaid, C. C., et al. (2025). Bridging Competency Gaps: A PPST-Aligned Assessment of Pre-Service Teachers at Initao College. https://www.ejournals.ph/article.php?id=30993*
11. *Estipona, J. D. R. (2025). Enhancing Student-Teachers' Readiness through Structured Coaching and Mentoring. Journal of Tertiary Education and Learning, 3(3), 37–39. https://doi.org/10.54536/jtel.v3i3.5100*