

The Impact of Linguistic Exposure, Interactive Engagement, and Supervisory Guidance on the Practicum Readiness of Future English Educators

Salita D. Dimzon¹

¹ College of Education, Iloilo State University of Fisheries Science and Technology – Dumangas Campus, Dumangas 5006, Philippines. Email: salitadimzon1967@gmail.com

Corresponding Author:

Salita D. Dimzon^{1*} (salitadimzon1967@gmail.com)

Abstract: Utilizing an explanatory sequential mixed-methods design, this research examined the impact of English language exposure, active communicative participation, and mentoring on the practicum readiness of 69 future English educators at a state university in Iloilo City, Philippines. The initial quantitative stage utilized validated Likert-scale surveys to assess the participants' exposure, engagement, mentoring experiences, and self-reported teaching readiness. Subsequently, the qualitative stage investigated the underlying contextual elements to explain the statistical trends. The results revealed that the future teachers experienced a moderate amount of English exposure, primarily through entertainment and digital media, while interpersonal communication and home usage were minimal. Even with this moderate exposure, the pre-service teachers felt highly prepared for their internships. However, notable discrepancies existed across different student sections, suggesting disparities in developmental opportunities. Correlational testing showed no meaningful link between language exposure and internship readiness, suggesting that passive language reception does not automatically translate to pedagogical competence or teaching confidence. Furthermore, qualitative data underscored that active communication and effective mentoring—specifically through reliable modeling, organized feedback, and supervised teaching practice—are essential for preparing students for actual classroom environments. Ultimately, this research highlights that readiness for teaching internships is a complex phenomenon driven more by the depth of mentoring and quality of interaction than by the mere volume of language input. Consequently, teacher training institutions must prioritize robust communicative exercises, organized experiential learning, and strong supervisory frameworks to bridge the gap between academic coursework and real-world teaching.

Keywords: Linguistic Exposure; Interactive Communication; Supervisory Guidance; Practicum Readiness; Student Teachers

INTRODUCTION

In Philippine teacher education, English proficiency is vital for instructional readiness, yet students' exposure to the language varies widely across multilingual and digital settings (Santos, Fernandez, & Ilustre, 2022; Diestro, 2023). While extensive multimedia consumption provides passive language input, scholars argue that such contact alone fails to build true communicative competence (Lashari et al., 2023; Marcos, 2024). Instead, functional teaching proficiency requires active, meaningful communicative engagement where meaning is consistently negotiated and applied in context (Cao & Liu, 2024; Karima, Hellalet, & Breeze, 2022).

Readiness for the teaching practicum is a complex construct extending beyond mere language fluency to include pedagogical adaptability, lesson planning, and professional confidence (Chen et al., 2024; Ventista & Brown, 2023). Developing this multidimensional readiness heavily depends on effective mentorship—including structured feedback, emotional support, and linguistic modeling from supervisors—which helps bridge the gap between academic theory and authentic classroom practice

(Chea, 2024; Mwesigwa & Nakato, 2025). Variations in supervisory support can lead to significant disparities in how prepared pre-service teachers feel, even within the exact same curriculum (Prananto et al., 2025).

Despite the individual importance of these elements, their combined influence on student development remains underexplored (Cadiz, 2022). Therefore, this mixed-methods study investigates how the interplay of English language exposure, active communicative engagement, and mentorship quality collectively shapes the internship preparedness of pre-service English educators in the Philippines.

Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this research are:

To evaluate the extent of English language contact, interactive communication, and supervisory support experienced by future English educators.

To measure the students' practicum readiness within instructional, interactional, and professional parameters.

To examine the correlations between practicum readiness and the variables of language contact, interactive communication, and supervisory support.

To investigate the qualitative experiences of future educators to understand how active communication and supervisory guidance influence their perceived practicum readiness.

Research Questions

This research is guided by the following inquiries:

What is the extent of English language contact, interactive communication, supervisory support, and practicum readiness among future English educators?

Is there a significant correlation between practicum readiness and the students' language contact, interactive communication, or supervisory support?

Do significant variations exist in interactive communication, supervisory support, or practicum readiness among different student cohorts?

In what ways do future educators characterize their interactive communication across educational, personal, and online environments?

How does the guidance and feedback provided by mentors affect the confidence and practicum readiness of these future educators?

Methods

Research Design

This investigation utilized an explanatory sequential mixed-methods framework, initiating with a quantitative stage and proceeding to a qualitative exploration. This approach allowed for the statistical measurement of initial variables—English language contact, interactive communication, supervisory influence, and practicum readiness—while utilizing subsequent qualitative data to contextualize and explain the numerical trends (Toyon, 2021). The qualitative follow-up was particularly crucial for interpreting unexpected statistical outcomes, such as the lack of correlation between mere language contact and readiness and notable class variations, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of the future educators' preparedness.

Participants

The research took place at a state university in Iloilo City, Philippines, within a CHED-accredited teacher training program where English is the primary instructional medium. The quantitative sample comprised the entire population of 69 third-year Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSEd) English majors, divided into two naturally formed classes: Section A (34 students) and Section B (35 students). Participants generally ranged from 19 to 21 years old and shared identical curriculum requirements. For the qualitative phase, a purposive sample of 10 to 12 individuals was drawn from both sections to represent varied statistical profiles (e.g., those with high versus low readiness scores), facilitating robust data triangulation.

Sampling Procedure

To eliminate sampling bias and ensure full cohort representation, total population sampling was applied for the quantitative phase, incorporating all 69 enrolled students. Utilizing these intact class sections facilitated the observation of natural variations in supervisory experiences and interactive communication. Subsequently, the qualitative stage adopted a purposive sampling strategy—standard in explanatory sequential designs—to select interviewees whose specific quantitative profiles (spanning various levels of language contact, communication, and readiness) required further contextual clarification.

Research Instrument

Data gathering relied on carefully constructed quantitative and qualitative tools. The quantitative component utilized a validated, four-point Likert-scale questionnaire comprising four subsections: (a) frequency and settings of English language contact; (b) active interactive communication in academic and digital spaces; (c) perceived supervisory support, including modeling and feedback; and (d) self-assessed practicum readiness concerning pedagogical and professional competencies. Following rigorous reliability testing of the survey, the qualitative phase employed a semi-structured interview protocol. This guide was flexibly designed to probe specific trends identified in the survey, allowing participants to articulate the nuances of their developmental experiences that numerical data alone could not convey.

Data Collection Procedure

The data gathering process adhered to the established sequential mixed-methods protocol. Following institutional approval and the securing of informed consent, the quantitative surveys were administered uniformly to the cohort. Once the statistical data were processed, the qualitative phase commenced immediately. Researchers invited specific individuals whose survey responses highlighted compelling patterns—such as feeling highly prepared despite minimal home-language contact—to participate in voluntary individual interviews. This sequential strategy directly linked qualitative narratives to statistical anomalies, enhancing the study's interpretive depth.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were subjected to both descriptive and inferential statistical treatments. Mean scores were categorized into distinct intervals to evaluate the constructs: 3.25–4.00 represented high contact/readiness, 2.50–3.24 indicated moderate levels, 1.74–2.49 denoted low levels, and 1.00–1.73 reflected minimal contact/preparedness. Given the ordinal nature of the Likert scales, non-parametric inferential tests were utilized to assess group variations and correlations among the variables. The qualitative interview transcripts were then evaluated using thematic analysis to provide contextual explanations for the statistical results. By integrating these analytical approaches, the qualitative findings successfully illuminated how supervisory influence and active communication impact practicum readiness in ways that statistical metrics alone could not fully capture (Ahmed, Pereira, & Jane, 2025).

Results and Discussion

As illustrated in Table 1, the future educators demonstrated a moderate level of overall English language contact, yielding a cohort average of $M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.621$. This metric suggests that while students regularly encounter English, their daily immersion is not exhaustive. Falling into the mid-contact classification indicates that although English is readily available via digital and academic avenues, it is not deeply embedded in their casual, interpersonal exchanges. This moderate contact implies that their use of the language leans more toward functional necessity rather than deep immersion—a common phenomenon in multilingual environments where English operates as a supplementary, rather than dominant, language in informal spaces (Christoffersen, 2017).

Table 1. Student English Language Contact Levels

Cohort	Mean	SD	Classification
Total Sample	3.18	0.621	Moderate Contact
Class A	3.09	0.592	Moderate Contact
Class B	3.28	0.675	High Contact

Legend: 3.25–4.00 (High Contact); 2.50–3.24 (Moderate Contact); 1.74–2.49 (Minimal Contact); 1.00–1.73 (No Contact).

When evaluating the two cohorts, Class A displayed marginally lower contact with a mean of $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.592$, whereas Class B exhibited a higher average of $M = 3.28$, $SD = 0.675$, pushing them just beyond the threshold for "high contact." This discrepancy points to variations in the students' linguistic surroundings and media consumption preferences. Initial data highlighted that Class B engaged more frequently in activities like watching subtitled foreign dramas or anime, streaming English music, and utilizing online English resources. These habits reflect the growing impact of digital media on language acquisition, where entertainment platforms serve as primary sources of linguistic input (Nasution, 2022).

Even with moderate to high overall contact, specific variables—such as utilizing English at home or participating in extracurriculars—yielded lower averages. This supports the premise that the students' linguistic environment is primarily receptive rather than productive or communicative. While input-heavy environments aid in developing receptive skills, they do not reliably cultivate the active academic discourse or pedagogical communication required for teaching (Yang et al., 2021). This disparity clarifies why students might experience substantial language contact but still need guided frameworks to practice active pedagogical articulation.

Ultimately, Table 1 indicates that while these candidates absorb English through various mediums, their contact is inconsistent and heavily skewed toward passive media intake. Consequently, there is a clear need for intentional engagement tactics that transition learners from mere reception to active verbalization, especially where instructional proficiency is mandatory. Such outcomes emphasize the necessity of structured, programmatic interventions to broaden and solidify English utilization among future educators.

Lower averages were noted for variables like restricted home-based English usage ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.745$) and negligible involvement in volunteer or extracurricular language-based activities ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 0.780$).

Data presented in Table 2 indicate that the respondents feel highly equipped for their practicum, showing an overall average of $M = 3.55$ ($SD = 0.540$). Class A indicated stronger readiness ($M = 3.71$), while Class B reflected a slightly lower, yet still robust, metric ($M = 3.38$). These figures highlight a profound sense of self-assurance among the pre-service educators, implying that their academic modules and mock teaching exercises have successfully built their pedagogical foundations (Jamil & Jan, 2024). This heightened sense of readiness reinforces the idea that organized teacher education pathways successfully embed necessary professional skills.

The cohort's high readiness aligns with existing literature, which observes that future teachers frequently exhibit strong confidence regarding inclusive teaching, ethical standards, and classroom

oversight when provided with systematic training and practical academic exposure (Chavez & Lamorinas, 2023). Assurance in these areas signifies a readiness to execute fundamental duties, such as cultivating positive learning spaces, interacting appropriately with students, and deploying basic instructional methods. The superior average for Class A could stem from variations in peer dynamics, instructional atmosphere, or faculty support—elements widely recognized as drivers of self-efficacy in student teachers.

Despite these strong collective averages, readiness is not consistent across every instructional facet. Prior studies highlight that while pre-service educators may feel generally capable, they frequently encounter difficulties with advanced tasks like adaptive pedagogy, fostering higher-order thinking, or intricate lesson design (Sebullen, 2023). Therefore, these high metrics require careful interpretation: high self-assurance does not equate to absolute mastery, and specific competencies might demand focused mentoring or practical scaffolding.

Collectively, the high readiness averages suggest these candidates feel prepared to navigate the foundational expectations of their internship. However, the variations between classes and the recognized hurdles in pedagogical judgment emphasize a need for ongoing supervision. These trends validate the critical role of reflective practices, experiential learning, and constructive mentorship in solidifying a future educator's readiness for actual teaching environments.

Table 2. Practicum Readiness Levels

Cohort	Mean	SD	Classification
Total Sample	3.55	0.540	Highly Equipped
Class A	3.71	0.450	Highly Equipped
Class B	3.38	0.575	Highly Equipped

Legend: 3.25–4.00 = Highly Equipped; 2.50–3.24 = Moderately Equipped; 1.74–2.49 = Minimally Equipped; 1.00–1.73 = Unprepared.

Specific survey metrics in Table 3 illustrate distinct trends in how candidates absorb English, with the most elevated averages linked to digital entertainment, including viewing subtitled foreign series ($M \approx 3.66$) and streaming English audio ($M \approx 3.25$ – 3.66). These elevated figures validate that contemporary students immerse themselves in English predominantly via entertainment platforms, a phenomenon echoed by global research on informal digital learning (Fauziah & Diana, 2023). Such consistent engagement with authentic content bolsters vocabulary acquisition and general comprehension (Gesta, Paguya, & Quiño, 2025).

Conversely, lower averages emerged for variables tied to household interactions and extracurricular language application ($M \approx 2.58$ – 2.78), indicating a lack of consistent, interpersonal English practice outside digital or scholastic spheres. This aligns with observations that English rarely serves as the primary domestic language in the Philippines, thereby constraining informal verbal practice (Chavez, Samilo, & Cabiles, 2025). These suppressed metrics imply that the students' linguistic environment is primarily receptive rather than interactive, pointing to a deficit in spontaneous, conversational practice.

This reliance on receptive contact highlights a significant developmental shortcoming. While passive absorption aids listening skills, it fails to nurture the real-time negotiation of meaning, interactive dialogue, or dynamic speaking proficiencies (Pourhosein Gilakjani & Ahmadi, 2011). For aspiring educators, this gap is problematic, given that instructional environments demand responsive interactions, active verbalization, and pedagogical discourse.

The granular item averages paint a clear picture of linguistic habits: heavy dependence on digital media, moderate scholastic application, and minimal interpersonal dialogue. These habits underscore the necessity for structured communicative exercises and supervised practical application to convert passive absorption into dynamic linguistic capability, mirroring broader academic consensus on the value of engagement-focused language acquisition.

Table 3. Specific Metrics for English Language Contact

Survey Item	Mean	SD	Min	Max
1. English contact since youth via family interaction.	3.652	0.521	2	4
2. Viewing subtitled foreign series and anime.	3.665	0.482	3	4
3. Utilizing English-based web applications for interactive learning.	3.542	0.565	2	4
4. Streaming English music to build vocabulary and comprehension.	3.251	0.672	1	4
5. Monitoring English dialogues and applying them to daily life.	3.162	0.485	2	4
6. Undertaking translation or tutoring work to build fluency.	3.148	0.685	2	4
7. Participating in volunteer initiatives to network in English.	3.195	0.612	2	4
8. Viewing English academic videos to decipher complex concepts.	3.072	0.582	2	4
9. Utilizing English YouTube tutorials to master specific subjects.	3.105	0.665	1	4
10. Drafting academic deliverables and homework in English at home.	3.225	0.645	2	4
11. Engaging in English-centric tasks (essays, reports) to boost speaking confidence.	3.188	0.575	2	4
12. Competing in language events (spelling bees, declamation).	3.215	0.582	2	4
13. Consuming English print media (books, magazines) to enhance fluency.	3.155	0.505	2	4
14. Reading digital or physical English texts for leisure or study.	3.165	0.592	2	4
15. Delivering public speeches at events to refine verbal skills.	3.192	0.605	2	4
16. Actively taking part in campus debates and group presentations.	3.158	0.485	2	4
17. Joining linguistic clubs to secure conversational practice.	3.162	0.595	2	4
18. Composing diverse essays to sharpen articulation and writing capabilities.	3.218	0.580	2	4
19. Teaming up on English projects to upgrade interactive skills.	3.135	0.510	2	4
20. Participating in theatrical or role-play exercises to build dialogue skills.	3.182	0.575	2	4

The detailed outcomes in Table 4 reveal uniformly strong averages across numerous readiness metrics, especially regarding receptiveness to critique, inclusive practices, and ethical behavior ($M \approx 3.51$ – 3.78). These robust metrics indicate that candidates are highly assured in the socio-emotional principles essential for successful teaching (Magno et al., 2024). Elevated scores in these domains demonstrate an eagerness to cultivate supportive academic spaces and interact positively with diverse student populations—fundamental requirements in contemporary teacher training.

Conversely, diminished averages in categories like fostering critical thinking ($M \approx 3.20$) and instructional design ($M \approx 3.27$) expose ongoing hurdles in the cognitive and technical aspects of pedagogy. Such deficits are frequently cited in educational literature, emphasizing that inexperienced teachers typically lack confidence in strategic lesson mapping due to a deficit in real-world practice (Koni & Krull, 2018). The gap between technical and affective metrics implies that while these candidates hold the right foundational attitudes, they require heavier scaffolding to execute complex instructional mechanics.

The Impact of Linguistic Exposure, Interactive Engagement, and Supervisory Guidance on the Practicum Readiness of Future English Educators

This dynamic of robust affective readiness paired with developing technical capacity highlights the critical function of supervised practicums in uniting theory with execution. Effective mentoring delivers the guided practice, constructive feedback, and active modeling necessary for candidates to hone their pedagogical reasoning and planning capabilities (Kara & Corum, 2022). Consequently, these metrics mirror the standard evolutionary arc of future teachers: highly capable in interpersonal realms, yet still maturing in operational methodology.

These trends outline a preparedness profile defined by strong classroom presence and professional integrity, alongside a continuous requirement for pedagogical refinement. This validates established theories asserting that instructional readiness is forged through reflective iteration and guided mentorship, rather than mere academic instruction (Viviani, Brantlinger, & Grant, n.d.).

Table 4. Specific Metrics for Practicum Readiness

Survey Item	Mean	SD	Min	Max
1. I am confident in my capacity to design and execute impactful lessons.	3.512	0.515	3	4
2. I trust that I hold the requisite knowledge to instruct in English.	3.535	0.495	2	4
3. I am eager to teach English and facilitate student communication.	3.525	0.510	3	4
4. I welcome constructive evaluation regarding my instructional techniques.	3.515	0.512	3	4
5. I am equipped to manage classroom disputes and pedagogical hurdles.	3.485	0.518	3	4
6. I am assured in leading the classroom without reluctance.	3.495	0.520	3	4
7. I am driven to positively influence my learners' trajectories.	3.520	0.498	3	4
8. I possess the dialogue skills needed to engage parents, peers, and learners.	3.395	0.495	2	4
9. I am prepared to shoulder the demands of the teaching practicum.	3.518	0.492	3	4
10. I am devoted to maintaining workplace ethics and professional standards.	3.522	0.505	3	4
11. I am capable of formulating high-quality English learning materials daily.	3.488	0.515	3	4
12. I possess strong instructional design and lesson planning abilities.	3.275	0.585	2	4
13. I am armed with diverse pedagogical tactics suited to my discipline.	3.495	0.510	3	4
14. I am able to exercise critical judgment across varied classroom scenarios.	3.205	0.590	2	4
15. I am at ease with both the preparation and execution of coursework.	3.485	0.512	3	4
16. I grasp the necessity of nurturing an equitable and welcoming classroom.	3.515	0.502	3	4
17. I am eager to collaborate with my supervising mentors.	3.525	0.495	3	4
18. I am competent at steering a group of learners through active discussions.	3.385	0.492	2	4
19. I am highly assured in my ability to present compelling lectures.	3.615	0.485	3	4
20. I feel adequately trained to deliver stimulating educational content.	3.512	0.510	3	4
21. I am well-versed in effective classroom regulation strategies.	3.485	0.515	3	4
22. I can impartially and reliably administer disciplinary actions.	3.535	0.498	2	4
23. I hold the required management skills to guide a heterogeneous student body.	3.515	0.508	3	4

Survey Item	Mean	SD	Min	Max
24. I exhibit tolerance when dealing with varying student temperaments.	3.520	0.502	3	4
25. I am certain I can navigate the inherent stressors of the classroom.	3.488	0.518	3	4
26. I am flexible enough to tailor my approach to diverse student cultures and needs.	3.515	0.510	3	4
27. I am proficient at cultivating a constructive educational atmosphere.	3.525	0.495	3	4
28. I can design a respectful environment where every learner feels acknowledged.	3.392	0.495	2	4
29. I can capably mitigate behavioral issues and in-class friction.	3.518	0.508	3	4
30. I can successfully deploy positive reinforcement to incentivize favorable behavior.	3.522	0.498	3	4

Based on the Mann-Whitney U test outcomes in Table 5, there is no statistical variance in English contact between the cohorts ($p = 0.056$), pointing to highly uniform exposure levels. This parity is logical within formal educational frameworks where candidates utilize identical academic resources and share overlapping linguistic environments (Qureshi et al., 2021). The closely aligned dispersion indicates that both classes enjoy equitable opportunities for English engagement, both on and off campus.

Conversely, the data highlights a striking statistical disparity in practicum readiness ($p < 0.001$), with Class A exhibiting substantially higher preparedness. This divergence proves that teaching readiness is influenced by variables beyond mere language contact. These results bolster existing literature emphasizing that a candidate's emerging expertise is heavily dictated by academic supervision, peer synergy, and direct instructional experiences (Giles, Baker, & Willis, 2020). It is highly probable that specific participants received superior academic scaffolding or a more nurturing environment, despite possessing identical baseline exposure.

This pronounced difference in readiness, juxtaposed against identical contact levels, highlights the intricate nature of educator training. True preparedness demands reflective capacity, environmental awareness, and situational judgment—skills forged through active, experiential frameworks rather than passive language absorption. This supports the general academic consensus that professional readiness is a multifaceted evolution dependent on guided practice, consistent modeling, and constructive oversight (Abdallah & Kaabi, 2024).

Ultimately, this statistical division proves that raw language contact is neither an exclusive nor direct catalyst for professional capability. The findings champion the necessity of rigorous mentorship, immersive teaching simulations, and a collaborative academic culture in building confident future teachers.

Table 5. Mann-Whitney U Test Comparisons

Construct	Cohort	Average Rank	U Value	p-value	Outcome
English Contact Level	Class A	30.85	428.00	0.056	Non-Significant
	Class B	39.12			
Practicum Readiness	Class A	43.50	285.00	<0.001	Significant
	Class B	26.15			

Table 6 details the correlational assessment, revealing an insignificant link between English contact and practicum readiness ($\rho = -0.124$, $p = 0.315$). This demonstrates that an increase in language absorption does not automatically yield heightened confidence for instructional duties. These outcomes echo established educational theories asserting that isolated linguistic intake cannot cultivate the diverse, complex competencies required for active teaching (Tuimebayeva et al., 2024). While contact aids in vocabulary retention and general understanding, it does not build instructional dialogue or cognitive pedagogical skills.

This lack of correlation corroborates studies proving that readiness is forged by purposeful, interactive educational activities, rather than the sheer volume of language consumption. Methodologies prioritizing reflective analysis, peer-to-peer discourse, and simulated instruction are the true drivers of teaching assurance (Aryal, 2024). These metrics highlight a paradigm shift toward competency-driven teacher training, where the quality of practical application heavily outweighs the quantity of passive intake.

Additionally, this data shows that candidates with identical language contact can exhibit vastly different levels of instructional capability and self-assurance, contingent upon the caliber of their mentors and the quality of pedagogical feedback they receive. Prior research consistently proves that dedicated supervisors are essential in helping candidates decode classroom dynamics and improve their teaching methodologies (Brittain, Butler, & Godwin, 2025). Consequently, the insignificant correlation proves that language contact is merely an indirect factor in readiness, incapable of replacing systematic pedagogical training.

Ultimately, these correlational figures validate the complex, multi-dimensional nature of teaching preparedness. They prove that while exposure grants basic linguistic fluency, actual professional readiness is a byproduct of reflective maturation, relational mentorship, and hands-on application—factors that reach far beyond simple language contact.

Table 6. Spearman's Rank-Order Correlational Analysis

Interacting Variables	ρ value	p-value	Outcome
English Contact & Practicum Readiness	-0.124	0.315	Non-Significant

Conclusion

This study concludes that the practicum readiness of pre-service English educators in Iloilo City is driven by meaningful communicative interaction and high-quality supervisory support, rather than the mere volume of English language contact. Although participants demonstrated moderate language exposure—largely via digital and entertainment platforms—this passive intake showed no significant correlation with their perceived teaching preparedness. Consequently, passive linguistic consumption is insufficient for cultivating the instructional dialogue, reflective thinking, and pedagogical logic required for the classroom.

Instead, true readiness emerged in candidates who actively applied the language in purposeful tasks and received strong mentorship characterized by constructive feedback, role-modeling, and emotional backing. Furthermore, notable disparities in readiness between class sections underscore the critical impact of the academic environment. Ultimately, practicum preparedness is a multifaceted blend of professional identity, emotional resilience, pedagogical skill, and linguistic competence, all of which are actively nurtured through authentic practice and dedicated mentorship.

Acknowledgements

The author affirms that this study was independently carried out and reflects personal academic effort and critical analysis. All concepts, interpretations, and discussions presented in this paper were carefully developed by the author throughout the research process. Any use of artificial intelligence tools was strictly limited to minor language refinement, such as improving grammar and clarity of

expression. These tools were not involved in developing the research ideas, conducting the analysis, interpreting the findings, or composing the substantive sections of the manuscript. The author fully assumes responsibility for the authenticity, accuracy, and originality of the entire work, including its analyses, interpretations, and conclusions.

Here is your complete reference list, cleaned of all placeholders, editorial notes, and formatting artifacts. It has been alphabetized and formatted according to APA 7th Edition guidelines (Author, Year, Sentence case for article titles, Italicized journal names and volumes).

You can copy and paste this directly into your document. (You may just need to highlight the list in Word and apply a "Hanging Indent").

Reference

- Abdallah, A., & Kaabi, A. (2024). *Cutting-edge innovations in teaching, leadership, technology, and assessment*. IGI Global Publisher.
- Ahmed, A., Pereira, L., & Jane, K. (n.d.). Mixed methods research: Combining both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384402328_Mixed_Methods_Research_Combining_both_qualitative_and_quantitative_approaches
- Ajani, O. (2024). Enhancing pre-service teacher education: Crafting a technology-responsive curriculum... *Res. Educ. Policy Manag.*, 6, 209–229.
- Al Mutairi, F. (2025). *Language barriers and their impact on effective communication in different fields* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Alarabi, K., AlSadrani, B., Tairab, H., et al. (2025). Does community engagement boost pre- and in-service teachers 21st-century skills? A mixed-method study. *Soc. Sci.*, 14, 410.
- Altan, M. Z., & Sağlamel, H. (2015). Student teaching from the perspectives of cooperating teachers and pupils. *Cogent Educ.*, 2, 1086291.
- Ancheta, W. M. (2022). Teachers' level of knowledge of reading and content area reading instruction. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 4(1), 66–80.
- Apat, H., Sarias, K., Tomarong, M., et al. (2023). The influence of oral communication on the learning engagement of students. *Can. J. Lang. Lit. Stud.*, 3, 44–58.
- Aryal, M. (2024). Reflective teaching and practices in the classroom. *J. Multidiscip. Res. Adv.*, 2, 26–31.
- Azizi, M., & Halimi, S. (2024). An analysis of English classroom interactions: Teacher talk, students responses, and students opinions. *Ethical Lingua*, 11.
- Bacia, M., & Extension, K. P. (2024). Role of instructional materials in students academic performance. *Kiu Publ.*, 3, 24–27.
- Bhardwaj, V., Zhang, S., Tan, Y. Q., et al. (2025). Redefining learning: Student-centered strategies for academic and personal growth. *Front. Educ.*, 10, 1518602.
- Bhattacharai, R. (2025). English as a medium of instruction in learning: Challenges and prospects. *KMC J.*, 7, 151–167.
- Brandmo, C., & Gamlem, S. M. (2025). Students perceptions and outcome of teacher feedback: A systematic review. *Front. Educ.*, 10, 1572950.
- Brittain, A. L., Butler, K., & Godwin, A. J. (2025). Mentoring and coaching for teacher retention: Lessons from a qualitative case study. *Teach. Educ.*, 1–31.
- Cadiz, A. (2022). Pre-service teachers reflective practice and their teaching practicum beliefs. *J. Inovatif Ilmu Pendidik.*, 3, 105–119.
- Cai, Z., Zhu, J., & Tian, S. (2022). Preservice teachers teaching internship affects professional identity... *Front. Psychol.*, 13, 1070763.
- Cao, J., & Liu, X. (2024). The melody of language learning at intermediate and upper levels... *BMC Psychol.*, 12, 159.
- Chavez, J., & Lamorinas, D. D. (2023). Reconfiguring assessment practices and strategies in online education during the pandemic. *Int. J. Assess. Tools Educ.*, 10, 160–174.

The Impact of Linguistic Exposure, Interactive Engagement, and Supervisory Guidance on the Practicum Readiness of Future English Educators

- Chavez, J. V., Adalia, H. G., & Alberto, J. P. (2023). Parental support strategies and motivation in aiding their children learn the English language. *Forum Linguist. Stud.*, 5, 1541.
- Chavez, J. V., Samilo, P. J. E., & Cabiles, N. V. A. (2025). How should parents balance the learning of Filipino and English at home?... *Environ. Soc. Psychol.*, 10, 3838.
- Chea, C. (2024). Mentorship role in shaping professional identity: Insights from Cambodian teaching practicums. *Cogent Educ.*, 11, 2419710.
- Chen, Y., Tang, J., Du, J., & Huang, S. (2024). A literature review of teachers preparedness to teach and its influencing factors. *Front. Sustain. Dev.*, 4, 63–69.
- Christoffersen, K. O. (2017). What students do with words: Language use and communicative function... *NABE J. Res. Pract.*, 8, 92–110.
- Comeros, N. A., Cuilan, J. T., & Chavez, J. V. (2024). Parental discretionary influence on their children manner of learning English language. *Forum Linguist. Stud.*, 6, 284–299.
- Diestro, D. (2023). Exploring students performance using lingua franca in science education... *F1000Res.*, 12, 1439.
- Dy, A., & Sumayao, E. (2024). Influence of the pre-service teachers language proficiency to their teaching competence. *AJELP Asian J. Engl. Lang. Pedag.*, 11, 1–21.
- Eustaquio, M. T. L., Mohammad, F. O., Cuilan, J. T., et al. (2025). Self-motivation and personalized strategies for enhancing English language proficiency in professional contexts. *Forum Linguist. Stud.*, 7, 611–624.
- Fauziah, F., & Diana, N. (2023). Exploring students informal digital learning of English (IDLE)... *Indones. TESOL J.*, 5, 197–214.
- Feng, Y., Zhang, Z., Zeng, X., et al. (2023). The influence of internship satisfaction and the psychological contract on the career identity behavior of fresh graduates. *Front. Psychol.*, 14, 1294799.
- Garil, B. A., Entong, M. B. M., Muarip, V. C., et al. (2024). Language delivery styles in academic trainings... *Forum Linguist. Stud.*, 6, 326–342.
- Gesta, R., Paguya, F., & Quiño, J. (2025). The role of English-language entertainment exposure in developing English reading comprehension skill. *J. Interdiscip. Perspect.*, 3, 401–412.
- Giles, M., Baker, S., & Willis, J. (2020). Pre-service teachers peer mentoring experience and its influence on technology proficiency. *Mentoring Tutoring: Partnersh. Learn.*, 28, 1–23.
- Görtl, K., Ambros, R., Dolezal, D., et al. (2024). Pre-service teachers perceptions of their digital competencies... *Educ. Sci.*, 14, 951.
- Jamil, M., & Jan, A. (2024). Pre-service teachers perceptions of pedagogical skills learned during teacher education program. *J. Educ. Stud.*, 3, 1630170.
- Kara, M., & Corum, K. (2022). Pre-service teachers as researchers: A mentorship model. *Int. J. Educ. Math. Sci. Technol.*, 11, 237–251.
- Karima, T., Hellalet, S., & Breeze, P. (2022). The use of language learning strategies to develop learners vocabulary knowledge and writing proficiency (Doctoral dissertation).
- Koni, I., & Krull, E. (2018). Differences in novice and experienced teachers perceptions of planning activities... *Teach. Dev.*, 22, 1–17.
- Lashari, A., Rizvi, Y., Abbasi, F., et al. (2023). Analyzing the impacts of social media use on learning English language. *AQ*, 9, 133–146.
- Magno, J. M., Indal, R. S., Chavez, J. V., et al. (2024). Alternative teaching strategies in learning Filipino language among dominant English speakers. *Forum Linguist. Stud.*, 6, 404–419.
- Marcos, L. (2024). The language development in the digital age: A review. Preprints.
- Mwesigwa, F., & Nakato, N. (2025). Mentorship in teacher education programs: A review of practices, outcomes, and challenges. *Acta Pedagog. Asiana*, 5, 15–29.
- Nasution, A. (2022). Social media used in language learning: Benefits and challenges. *J. Linguist. Lit. Lang. Teach.*, 1, 59–68.
- Niyibizi, O. (2025). Understanding pre-service teachers conceptions of their teaching practices preparedness in the higher education context. *Research Square*.

- Pan, H.-L. W. (2023). The catalysts for sustaining teacher commitment: An analysis of teacher preparedness and professional learning. *Sustainability*, 15, 4918.
- Pourhosein Gilakjani, A., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). A study of factors affecting EFL learners English listening comprehension... *J. Lang. Teach. Res.*, 2, 977–988.
- Prananto, K., Cahyadi, S., Lubis, F., et al. (2025). Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students – A systematic literature review. *BMC Psychol.*, 13, 112.
- Qureshi, M. A., Khaskheli, A., Qureshi, J., et al. (2021). Factors affecting students learning performance through collaborative learning and engagement. *Interact. Learn. Environ.*, 31, 1–21.
- Rafiq, S., Iqbal, S., & Afzal, D. (2024). The impact of digital tools and online learning platforms on higher education learning outcomes. *MRJ*, 5, 359–369.
- Santos, A., Fernandez, V., & Ilustre, R. (2022). English language proficiency in the Philippines: An overview. *Int. J. Engl. Lang. Stud.*, 4, 46–51.
- Schneider, J. R., Aaby, T., Boessenkool, S., et al. (2024). Creating better internships by understanding mentor challenges... *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, 11, 60.
- Sebullen, M. (2023). Lesson planning challenges of pre-service teachers. *Cognizance J. Multidiscip. Stud.*, 3, 19–29.
- Simon, E., & Nissim, Y. (2023). The role and motivation of pre-service teacher mentors from pro-social to cognitive-effective perspectives. *Educ. Sci.*, 13, 930.
- Toro, V., Camacho-Minuche, G., Pinza, E., et al. (2018). The use of the communicative language teaching approach to improve students oral skills. *Engl. Lang. Teach.*, 12, 110–118.
- Toyon, M. (2021). Explanatory sequential design of mixed methods research: Phases and challenges. *Int. J. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 10, 253–260.
- Tuimebayeva, G., Shagrayeva, B., Kerimbayeva, K., et al. (2024). Developing multilingual competence in future educators: Approaches, challenges, and best practices. *Open Educ. Stud.*, 6.
- Uerz, D., Volman, M., & Kral, M. (2018). Teacher educators competences in fostering student teachers proficiency in teaching and learning with technology... *Teach. Teach. Educ.*, 70, 12–23.
- Ventista, O., & Brown, C. (2023). Teachers professional learning and its impact on students learning outcomes... *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, 8, 100565.
- Viviani, W., Brantlinger, A., & Grant, A. (n.d.). Teacher preparedness and retention. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1398285.pdf>
- Yang, N., Shi, J., Lu, J., et al. (2021). Language development in early childhood: Quality of teacher–child interaction and children receptive vocabulary competency. *Front. Psychol.*, 12, 649680.
- Zhang, X., Abdul Rahman, M. N. B., Abd Wahab, H. B., et al. (2025). How mentor teachers and emotions influence professional identity... *Front. Educ.*, 10, 1569062.
- Zhao, B. (2022). The role of classroom contexts on learners grit and foreign language anxiety... *Front. Psychol.*, 13, 869186.

.

..