



REVIEWER REPORT

Manuscript Title:	Challenges of Pre-service Teachers in using the Filipino Language as a Medium of Instruction during Internship
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

EDITOR

Comments and Recommendations

This study examines linguistic challenges among preservice teachers. The scale of the study (n=10) and the reliance on subjective self-assessment of language proficiency severely limit the impact. For a journal, we would expect objective linguistic analysis of classroom discourse rather than retrospective interviews about "feeling" anxious. The findings regarding code-switching are standard in sociolinguistics and offer limited novelty.

REVIEWER 1

Specific Comments and Recommendations

Define the specific dialect or regional variation of Filipino used in the study context (Iligan City), as this materially affects proficiency dynamics.

The distinction between "social moderation" and standard mentoring is unclear.

Please clarify the duration of the internship and the frequency of Filipino-medium instruction required.

The abstract mentions survey responses, but the methodology focuses on interviews. Clarify the role of the survey data.

"Teacher presence" is a vague construct; operationalize this in the context of linguistic authority.

General Comments and Recommendations

The study conflates "language proficiency" with "teaching confidence." The authors must provide objective measures of the participants' Filipino fluency (e.g., standardized test scores or linguistic analysis of lesson plans) to validate the claim that lexical deficits are the primary driver of code-switching. Without this, the results may simply reflect general novice teacher anxiety rather than specific linguistic barriers.

The analysis of code-switching needs technical precision. The authors should categorize the reported code-switching instances using established sociolinguistic frameworks (e.g., inter-sentential vs. intra-sentential, metaphorical vs. situational). The current description treats all



switching as a "compensatory strategy" for deficit, ignoring potential pedagogical functions of translanguaging.

The link between "clarity deficits" and "classroom management" is asserted but not demonstrated. The authors should provide specific incidents or observational data where language breakdown directly precipitated behavioral disruption. The current causal link relies entirely on participant speculation.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

REVIEWER 2

<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>Provide the interview protocol and key prompts, and indicate the interview language used.</p> <p>Report how confidentiality was protected given a small cohort and identifiable placement contexts.</p> <p>Define code-switching more precisely and distinguish strategic scaffolding from proficiency-driven repair.</p> <p>Ensure the Results separate semantic themes from interpretive claims about identity formation or efficacy unless directly supported by the data excerpts.</p> <p>Clarify whether member checking occurred and what changes resulted.</p>

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
<p>The manuscript addresses an important implementation issue in language-in-education policy, but the design is small and localized and does not deliver the mechanistic insight or broad advance. The main contribution is descriptive themes about proficiency gaps and coping. In addition, methodological description is too thin for evaluation. The manuscript should specify the internship contexts (grade levels, subject areas, school types), participant language backgrounds, and how "Filipino academic register" proficiency was assessed or inferred. Currently, the reader cannot judge whether challenges reflect general internship stress, specific language policy demands, or local placement conditions.</p>



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accept the manuscript for publication.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
The manuscript, in its current form, is not acceptable for publication and requires substantial revision.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			