

Factors Associated with Licensure Examination Performance of the Teacher Education Graduates: Inputs for a Proposed Curriculum Enhancement

Noel R. Palomares¹, Romalyn M. Mandia², Bernadette N. Del Prado³, Joy S. Montejo⁴
^{1,2,3,4}*College of Education, Marinduque State University*

Abstract—This study investigates the factors associated with the licensure examination performance of teacher education graduates from Marinduque State College, now Marinduque State University. It examines a range of variables including demographic and academic profiles, personal attributes such as study habits, motivation, time management, and anxiety levels, as well as the extent of support received from family, peers, the community, and social environment. Institutional support was also considered, specifically in terms of access to review materials, faculty assistance, facilities, and review classes. Utilizing a descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from graduates of the College of Education through researcher-made questionnaires. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed in analyzing the results. Findings reveal that civil status, community and environmental support, and institutional support statistically significantly influence licensure examination performance. Notably, the AACUP accreditation level of the academic program had a strong positive effect, indicating that graduates from more highly accredited programs tend to perform better. In contrast, variables such as age, GPA, income, family and peer support, and education-related attributes did not yield significant effects, suggesting that personal and academic characteristics alone may not be sufficient predictors of licensure performance. These results underscore the importance of institutional quality and external support systems in improving licensure performance. The study recommends targeted curriculum enhancements, improved review structures, and strengthened student support services as essential strategies to increase teacher education graduates' success in the licensure examination.

Index Terms—*Curriculum Enhancement, Institutional Support, Licensure Examination Performance, Teacher Education Graduates*

I. INTRODUCTION

Licensure examinations are essential benchmarks for assessing both the readiness of graduates and the quality of the institutions that train them. In the Philippines, the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) serves as a regulatory tool to uphold professional teaching standards, as mandated by Republic Act 7836 or the Teacher Professionalization Act of 1994 [6], [19]. Administered by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC), the LET ensures that teacher education graduates meet national and global competency standards [9], [13].

LET performance is widely regarded as a reflection of institutional effectiveness. It is closely linked to the accreditation status of Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs), whose curricula and instruction are shaped to align with the National Competency-Based Teacher Standards (NCBTS) [6]. In response, TEIs have adopted various strategies curriculum revisions, stricter admission policies, and intensive review programs to improve licensure outcomes [5]. Yet, despite these efforts, the national LET passing rate has averaged only 31% since 2009, with about half of TEIs falling below this benchmark [37].

Research has identified a range of factors affecting LET performance, including demographic variables, academic achievement, English proficiency, and teacher-related characteristics such as competence and workload [18]. Institutional factors such as admission policies, curriculum design, instructional quality, and resources also play a significant role.

Given these ongoing challenges, this study investigates the LET performance of Bachelor of Secondary Education graduates and examines the

factors influencing their success. The findings aim to inform curriculum enhancements, guide institutional improvements, and support both student achievement and faculty development through evidence-based strategies.

Research problem or objectives (include hypotheses, if necessary)

This paper will focus on the licensure examination performance of the graduates and its associated factors. Specifically, this will address the following research objectives.

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 Demographic
 - 1.1.1 Age
 - 1.1.2 Sex
 - 1.1.3 Civil Status
 - 1.1.4 Monthly Family Income prior to taking the LET
 - 1.2 Academic
 - 1.2.1 AACUP Accreditation Level of the Program
 - 1.2.2 Grade Point Average (GPA)
 - 1.2.3 Field of Specialization
 - 1.2.4 Attendance to LET review (frequency and duration)
 - 1.2.5 Attendance to Final Coaching and Pre-LET/Mock Exam
 - 1.3 Attributes
 - 1.3.1 Study Habits
 - 1.3.2 Motivation
 - 1.3.3 Time Management Skills
2. What is the level of support received by the respondents from the following social groups:
 - 2.1 Family
 - 2.2 Peer
 - 2.3 Community & Social Environment
3. To what extent in the institutional support provided in terms of:
 - 3.1 Availability of Review Materials
 - 3.2 Faculty Support
 - 3.3 Access to Facilities
 - 3.4 Provision of LET review Classes

4. What is the performance of the respondents in the Licensure Examination for Teachers?
5. Which among the abovementioned variables predict the performance of the respondents in the Licensure Examination for Teachers?

Ho: The profile, the level of social group support and institutional support do not statistically predict the performance of the graduates in the Licensure Examination.

II. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Profile of the respondents in terms of demographic, academic, and attributes
Table I shows that the demographic profile of the respondents indicates that the majority (74.29%) are young graduates aged 19 to 24, suggesting that most candidates pursued the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) shortly after completing their undergraduate studies. This age group is likely to benefit from recent academic exposure, which may enhance their performance on the examination. In terms of sex, a substantial proportion (70%) of respondents is female, reflecting the prevailing gender distribution in the teaching profession, where women continue to represent the majority. With regard to civil status, most respondents are single (78.57%), which may imply fewer familial responsibilities that could otherwise detract from time and focus allocated to exam preparation. Concerning socio-economic background, over half of the respondents (51.43%) reported a monthly family income of less than ₱11,000, classifying them within the low-income bracket. This financial limitation may hinder access to supplementary review resources or formal review programs, potentially impacting examination performance. These findings underscore the importance of a teacher education curriculum that not only reinforces academic content but also systematically integrates LET preparation. Furthermore, targeted support mechanisms should be established to assist financially disadvantaged students, thereby enhancing their opportunities for success in the licensure examination.

Table I
Demographic profile distribution of the respondents

Demographic Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
19-24 (Young Graduates)	52	74.29
25-29 (Early Professionals)	11	15.71
30-34 (Developing Professionals)	6	8.57
35-44 (Mid-Career)	1	1.43
Total	70	100.00
Sex		
Male	21	30.00
Female	49	70.00
Total	70	100.00
Civil Status		
Single	55	78.57
Married	14	20.00
Separated	1	1.43
Total	70	100.00
Monthly Family Income prior Taking the LET/BLEPT		
Below 11,000	36	51.43
11,001 – 20,000	18	25.71
20,001 – 50,000	15	21.43
Above 50,000	1	1.43
Total	70	100.00

Table II
Academic profile distribution of the respondents

Academic Profile	Frequency	Percentage
AACCUP Accreditation Level of the Program		
Level 3	46	65.71
Level 2	14	20.00
Level 1	6	8.57
Not yet Accredited	4	5.71
Total	70	100.00
GPA		
1.0 (95 – 100; Excellent)	0	0.00
1.10 – 1.50 (90 – 94; Superior)	2	2.86
1.60 – 2.00 (85 – 89; Very Good)	49	70.00
2.10 – 2.50 (80 – 84; Good)	15	21.43
2.60 – 3.00 (75 – 79; Fair)	4	5.71
5.00 (Below 75; Failed)	0	0.00
Total	70	100.00
Field of Specialization		
BCAEd/MAPHE	3	4.29
BTLEd/THE	6	8.57
General Education	4	5.71

Mathematics	21	30.00
Science	18	25.71
Social Science	12	17.14
Others (were not specified)	6	8.57
Total	70	100.00
Attendance to LET/BLEPT Review Classes		
Attended	53	75.71
Not Attended	17	24.29
Total	70	100.00
Attendance to LET/BLEPT Final Coaching		
Attended	46	65.71
Not Attended	24	34.29
Total	70	100.00
Attendance to Pre-LET/BLEPT/Mock Exam		
Attended	45	64.29
Not Attended	25	35.71
Total	70	100.00

Table II suggest that majority of the respondents (65.71%) graduated from academic programs accredited at Level III by the Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities in the Philippines (AACCUP), indicating that most were trained in institutions recognized for maintaining high standards in teacher education. This level of accreditation is typically associated with well-established quality assurance mechanisms, which are likely to contribute to the development of strong foundational knowledge and increased preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). In terms of academic performance, 70% of the respondents attained a general weighted average (GWA) within the 1.60 to 2.00 range, classified as “Very Good,” suggesting that the majority possessed a strong academic background. Notably, no respondents fell into the failing or lowest GWA categories, indicating an overall academically competent cohort. With respect to field of

specialization, Mathematics (30%) and Science (25.71%) were the most frequently represented disciplines. In terms of LET preparation strategies, 75.71% of the respondents reported attending review classes, 65.71% participated in final coaching sessions, and 64.29% engaged in pre-LET or mock examinations. These figures indicate that a substantial portion of the respondents took part in structured review and supplementary preparation activities, which are widely recognized for enhancing content retention, reinforcing conceptual understanding, and improving test-taking skills. Conversely, 24.29% did not attend review classes, 34.29% did not participate in final coaching, and 35.71% did not take part in mock examinations. The absence of such preparatory measures among this segment of respondents may place them at a relative disadvantage, potentially affecting their readiness and performance in the licensure examination.

Table III
Profile of the Respondents in terms of their Education Attributes

Indicator	Mean	SD	D	DI
Study Habits				
1. I allocate a specific time daily for studying.	4.11	1.001	A	H
2. I have a quiet and organized study environment.	3.77	1.010	A	H
3. I regularly review my notes and materials after class.	3.70	1.089	A	H
4. I make use of additional learning resources (e.g., books, online materials).	4.19	1.040	A	H
5. I create and follow a study schedule.	3.77	1.052	A	H

6. I actively participate in review sessions or study groups.	3.83	1.239	A	H
7. I take regular breaks during study sessions to avoid burnout.	4.01	1.083	A	H
8. I use effective study techniques (e.g., summarizing, mind mapping, or flashcards).	3.99	1.056	A	H
9. I prioritize studying subjects or topics I find most challenging.	4.17	0.963	A	H
10. I avoid procrastinating when it comes to studying.	3.74	1.031	A	H
Composite Mean	3.93	1.067	A	H
Motivation				
1. I am determined to pass the Licensure Examination for Teachers.	4.67	0.880	SA	VH
2. I feel excited and confident about becoming a licensed teacher.	4.40	0.954	SA	VH
3. I set specific goals for my LET preparation.	4.32	1.036	SA	VH
4. I reward myself after achieving study milestones.	4.01	1.036	A	H
5. I am inspired by my mentors, teachers, or peers.	4.23	0.981	SA	VH
6. I visualize myself succeeding in the LET.	4.50	0.913	SA	VH
7. I remind myself of the reasons I want to become a teacher.	4.41	0.909	SA	VH
8. I remain positive even when faced with challenges in preparation.	4.43	0.894	SA	VH
9. I believe my hard work will pay off in the examination.	4.44	0.942	SA	VH
10. I stay committed to my study schedule regardless of distractions.	4.06	1.034	A	H
Composite Mean	4.35	0.972	SA	VH
Time Management Skills				
1. I plan my day in advance, allocating time for studying, rest, and other activities.	3.73	1.089	A	H
2. I meet the deadlines I set for my LET preparation tasks.	3.81	1.054	A	H
3. I avoid wasting time on unproductive activities.	3.74	0.973	A	H
4. I balance my review sessions with other responsibilities (e.g., work, family duties).	4.14	1.067	A	H
5. I break down larger tasks into smaller, more manageable ones.	4.00	1.036	A	H
6. I adjust my schedule effectively when unexpected events arise.	3.79	1.062	A	H
7. I dedicate more time to studying as the exam date approaches.	4.11	1.097	A	H
8. I avoid cramming and prefer consistent study sessions.	3.79	1.075	A	H
9. I keep track of my progress using a planner or checklist.	3.67	1.248	A	H
10. I ensure I get adequate rest and maintain a healthy lifestyle.	4.11	1.043	A	H
Composite Mean	3.89	1.083	A	H
Grand Mean	4.06	1.041	A	H

Legend:

<i>Mean Interval</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation</i>
4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High (VH)
3.40-4.19	Agree (A)	High (HI)
2.60-3.39	Moderately Agree (MA)	Average (Ave)
1.80-2.59	Disagree (D)	Low (L)
1.00-1.79	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low (VL)

Table III presents the educational attributes of the respondents, specifically focusing on their study habits, motivation, and time management skills, factors that are widely recognized as non-cognitive predictors of academic and licensure examination performance [1], [16]. The overall grand mean of 4.06 (standard deviation = 1.041), interpreted as "Agree"

with a high descriptive interpretation, indicates that respondents generally exhibit favorable academic behaviors supportive of success in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET).

With regard to study habits, respondents reported a composite mean of 3.93, also interpreted as high,

suggesting consistent and intentional engagement in study-related behaviors. The highest-rated item *utilizing additional learning resources* (mean = 4.19) reflects a proactive approach to independent learning. This aligns with the study of [33] who emphasized the value of academic resourcefulness and self-directed learning in preparing for licensure examinations. Other positively rated behaviors included *prioritizing difficult topics* (mean = 4.17) and *allocating specific study time* (mean = 4.11), both of which are consistent with effective self-regulated learning strategies known to enhance academic achievement [20]. Nonetheless, relatively lower mean scores for *consistent note review* (mean = 3.70) and *avoiding procrastination* (mean = 3.74) point to areas where students may benefit from structured interventions and support.

Motivation emerged as the strongest domain, with a composite mean of 4.35, interpreted as “Strongly Agree” or very high. The highest-rated motivational indicators, *determination to pass the LET* (mean = 4.67), *visualizing success* (mean = 4.50), and *belief in the payoff of hard work* (mean = 4.44) reflect a high level of intrinsic motivation and goal orientation.

These findings are strongly aligned with self-efficacy theory [34], which posits that individuals’ belief in their capacity to succeed significantly influences their performance, particularly in high-stakes contexts. Supporting this, intrinsically motivated individuals are more likely to exhibit persistence and resilience in academic tasks, ultimately leading to higher performance outcomes [27].

Time management skills were also rated favorably, with a composite mean of 3.89 (high). Respondents reported effective management of competing responsibilities (*balancing review with other duties*, mean = 4.14) and intensifying study efforts as the exam approached (*increasing study time near the LET*, mean = 4.11). These findings are consistent with recent literature highlighting the role of time management in reducing academic stress and enhancing examination performance [30]. However, comparatively lower ratings in *daily planning* (mean = 3.73) and *progress monitoring* (mean = 3.67) reveal potential gaps in planning and self-monitoring, which are essential components of effective time use and productivity.

2. Level of social group support received by the respondents

Table IV

Level of Support Received by the Respondents from their Family, Peer, and Community and Social Environment

Indicator	Mean	SD	D	DI
Family Support				
1. My family consistently provides emotional encouragement during my preparation for the LET/BLEPT.	4.29	1.092	SA	H
2. My family ensures I have a quiet and conducive environment for studying.	4.07	1.054	A	H
3. My family helps me manage household responsibilities to focus on exam preparation.	4.16	1.016	A	H
4. My family provides financial assistance or resources to support my LET/BLEPT preparation.	4.16	1.223	A	H
5. My family celebrates my small achievements during my LET/BLEPT review process.	3.97	1.204	A	H
Composite Mean	4.13	1.119	A	H
Peer Support				
1. My peers motivate me to stay committed to my study schedule for the LET/BLEPT.	4.06	1.006	A	H
2. My peers are available to help clarify difficult concepts during our study sessions.	4.06	1.048	A	H
3. My peers share valuable review materials and resources for LET/BLEPT preparation.	4.06	1.020	A	H

4. I feel encouraged to continue studying when I see my peers' dedication to LET/BLEPT preparation.	4.17	1.007	A	H
5. My peers offer emotional support when I feel anxious about the LET/BLEPT.	4.00	1.063	A	H
Composite Mean	4.07	1.025	A	H
Community & Social Environment				
1. The community I belong to expresses encouragement and pride in my efforts to pass the LET/BLEPT.	3.63	1.194	A	H
2. Local organizations or institutions provide resources or programs to assist LET/BLEPT takers.	3.19	1.333	MA	Ave
3. The social environment around me is free from distractions that hinder my LET/BLEPT preparation.	3.49	1.139	A	H
4. I receive words of motivation and support from members of my social network.	3.69	1.123	A	H
5. Community leaders or influencers recognize and promote the value of passing the LET/BLEPT.	3.59	1.148	A	H
Composite Mean	3.51	1.196	A	H
Grand Mean	3.90	1.148	A	H

Legend:

<i>Mean Interval</i>	<i>Description (D)</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation (DI)</i>
4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High
3.40-4.19	Agree (A)	High
2.60-3.39	Moderately Agree (MA)	Average
1.80-2.59	Disagree (D)	Low
1.00-1.79	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low

Table IV presents the levels of support received by respondents from three core social groups, the family, peers, and the community and social environment during their preparation for the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). These forms of social support are increasingly recognized as pivotal non-academic determinants of academic persistence, psychological resilience, and performance in high-stakes examinations. The results reveal a grand mean of 3.90 (standard deviation = 1.148), indicating that respondents generally experienced a high level of support from their immediate and extended social environments.

Among the three domains, family support emerged as highly rated, with a composite mean of 4.13, categorized as high. Notably, respondents strongly agreed that they *received consistent emotional encouragement* (mean = 4.29), *financial assistance* (mean = 4.16), and *practical support, such as help with managing household responsibilities* (mean = 4.16), during their LET preparation. These findings

affirm that family support serves as a critical buffer against academic stress and facilitates greater cognitive and emotional engagement [4], [14]. Furthermore, *the provision of a conducive study environment and recognition of incremental academic progress* (means = 4.07 and 3.97 respectively) underscore the importance of both emotional and instrumental support in sustaining students' motivation and focus throughout prolonged periods of exam preparation [33].

Peer support was also rated favorably, with a composite mean of 4.07, likewise interpreted as high. Respondents identified their *peers as a consistent source of academic motivation* (mean = 4.17), *knowledge exchange* (mean = 4.06), and *emotional reassurance* (mean = 4.00). These findings resonate with the literature highlighting the role of peer networks in fostering academic self-efficacy, shared accountability, and reduced test anxiety [31]. Particularly within collaborative learning environments, peer groups often function as informal

support systems that enhance both conceptual understanding and emotional well-being.

In contrast, support from the community and broader social environment recorded the lowest composite mean at 3.51, albeit still within the high descriptive range. While respondents acknowledged *receiving general encouragement from their communities* (mean = 3.63) and *motivation from members of their social network* (mean = 3.69), they reported comparatively *limited access to tangible resources or structured community programs aimed at LET preparation* (mean = 3.19, interpreted as average). These findings suggest a relative underutilization or perhaps limited availability of institutional and community-level academic support systems. As emphasized in previous studies [21], the involvement of local government units (LGUs), non-government organizations (NGOs), and educational institutions in offering scholarships, review sessions, or mentorship

programs can be especially impactful for disadvantaged LET takers.

The findings underscore the pivotal role of immediate social networks, particularly familial and peer support in bolstering the licensure examination preparedness of teacher education graduates. Conversely, support at the community level remains comparatively underdeveloped, highlighting a critical gap that warrants focused policy and programmatic interventions. To address this disparity, curriculum enhancement efforts should extend beyond academic content to formally integrate structured social support mechanisms. These may include the establishment of peer mentoring programs, active parental engagement initiatives, and strategic collaborations with community stakeholders to deliver accessible psychosocial and academic resources. Aligning with the assertions of [32], fortifying these socio-educational ecosystems is essential to ensuring equitable access to support services and ultimately improving licensure examination success rates.

3. Extent of the institutional support provided to the respondents

Table V

Institutional Support Received by the Respondents in terms of Availability of Review Materials, Faculty Support, Access to Facilities, and Provision of LET Review Classes

Indicator	Mean	SD	D	DI
Availability of Review Materials				
1. The institution provides updated review materials relevant to the LET.	3.67	1.280	A	H
2. The review materials provided by the institution cover all major content areas of the LET.	3.62	1.238	A	H
3. The review materials are accessible to all students preparing for the LET.	3.52	1.208	A	H
4. The institution ensures the review materials are user-friendly and organized for effective learning.	3.65	1.223	A	H
5. Supplementary resources (e.g., mock exams, online content) are provided by the institution.	3.71	1.270	A	H
Composite Mean	3.63	1.238	A	H
Faculty Support				
1. Faculty members are available for consultation and guidance during LET preparation.	3.68	1.157	A	H
2. The faculty demonstrates expertise in addressing LET-related topics and concerns.	3.88	1.119	A	H
3. Faculty members actively encourage and motivate students to excel in the LET.	3.96	1.091	A	H
4. The faculty organizes focused discussions or study sessions for LET takers.	3.62	1.261	A	H
5. I feel adequately supported by the faculty in overcoming challenges during LET preparation.	3.72	1.157	A	H

	Composite Mean	3.77	1.158	A	H
Access to Facilities					
1. The institution provides designated study spaces conducive to LET preparation.	3.39	1.140	MA	Ave	
2. The library is well-equipped with relevant and updated resources for LET review.	3.27	1.128	MA	Ave	
3. The institution ensures reliable access to computers, internet, and online resources for LET preparation.	3.23	1.157	MA	Ave	
4. The facilities provided for LET preparation are available during convenient hours.	3.26	1.163	MA	Ave	
5. The institution ensures that review venues are comfortable and conducive to learning.	3.40	1.221	A	H	
	Composite Mean	3.31	1.156	MA	Ave
Provision of LET Review Classes					
1. The institution organizes comprehensive review classes covering all LET domains.	3.55	1.290	A	H	
2. The LET review classes are conducted by qualified and experienced instructors.	3.74	1.336	A	H	
3. The schedule of review classes is convenient for all LET takers.	3.72	1.316	A	H	
4. The institution offers sufficient practice tests and mock exams during review classes.	3.65	1.304	A	H	
5. I feel that the LET review classes provided by the institution significantly enhance my readiness for the exam.	3.65	1.293	A	H	
	Composite Mean	3.66	1.301	A	H
	Grand Mean	3.60	1.226	A	H

Legend:

<i>Mean Interval</i>	<i>Description (D)</i>	<i>Descriptive Interpretation (DI)</i>
4.20-5.00	Strongly Agree (SA)	Very High (VH)
3.40-4.19	Agree (A)	High (H)
2.60-3.39	Moderately Agree (MA)	Average (Ave)
1.80-2.59	Disagree (D)	Low (L)
1.00-1.79	Strongly Disagree (SD)	Very Low (VL)

Table V reflects respondents' perceptions of institutional support across four key areas: availability of review materials, faculty support, access to facilities, and provision of LET review classes. The overall grand mean of 3.60 (standard deviation = 1.226), interpreted as "Agree" with a high descriptive rating, indicates a generally favorable assessment of institutional contributions to LET preparation. However, variations among domains point to both strengths and gaps that are instructive for curriculum and policy enhancement.

Faculty support received the highest composite mean = 3.77, suggesting that students perceived faculty members as approachable, knowledgeable, and

motivational throughout the licensure review process. Faculty members were also acknowledged for organizing study sessions and offering personalized guidance. These findings affirm the role of faculty engagement in fostering students' academic confidence and exam preparedness.

Review materials were also rated positively (mean = 3.63), with respondents agreeing that institutions provide relevant and updated content, including supplementary resources such as mock exams and digital materials. This aligns with the study of [33], who emphasized the importance of resource accessibility and content relevance in high-stakes exam contexts. However, the relatively high standard

deviation indicates that experiences may vary across different institutional settings.

LET review classes also garnered a high rating (mean = 3.66), reflecting students' appreciation for structured and well-delivered preparation sessions. Respondents recognized the expertise of instructors and the value of practice exams in building exam readiness. These structured interventions are well-supported in literature as effective strategies to consolidate content mastery and develop test-taking skills [3].

Meanwhile, access to facilities was rated the lowest (mean = 3.31), interpreted as “Moderately Agree” with an average descriptive interpretation. Respondents reported challenges in accessing quiet study spaces, updated library resources, and reliable technological infrastructure. These limitations may hinder equitable study opportunities, especially

among students who rely heavily on campus resources [26]. Improving physical and digital infrastructure is therefore critical to enabling consistent and uninterrupted review practices.

Collectively, the data suggests that while institutional support is generally adequate, particularly in the areas of faculty engagement and instructional review, the relative deficiency in facilities access requires targeted interventions. As argued in some studies, comprehensive licensure preparation must be underpinned by well-integrated institutional systems that address both instructional and environmental factors. Thus, any proposed curriculum enhancement should institutionalize LET-aligned academic support, improve access to physical and digital resources, and formalize faculty-driven mentoring and review mechanisms [23], [32].

4. Performance of the respondents in the Licensure Examination for Teachers

Table VI

Performance of the respondents in the Licensure Examination for Teachers

LET Rating	General Education		Professional Education		Field of Specialization		Overall Rating	
	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%
90% above	21	30.0	6	8.6	6	9.1	7	10.0
85% - 89%	25	35.7	23	32.9	26	39.4	29	41.4
80% - 84%	16	22.9	29	41.4	15	22.7	25	35.7
75% - 79%	8	11.4	12	17.1	17	25.8	9	12.9
74% and below	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	3.0	7	10.0
Total	70	100.0	70	100.0	66	100.0	70	100.0

Legend:

90% and above (*Excellent*); 85% - 89% (*Very Satisfactory*); 80% - 84% (*Satisfactory*); 75% - 79% (*Fair*); 74% and below (*Poor*)

Table VI present a generally positive profile of LET performance among teacher education graduates, with the majority scoring within the “Very Satisfactory” (41.4%) and “Satisfactory” (35.7%) ranges in their overall ratings. Strong outcomes were particularly evident in General Education, where 30% attained “Excellent” ratings (90% and above), suggesting solid foundational knowledge and the role of general content mastery in LET success [17].

In Professional Education, while 41.4% achieved “Satisfactory” and 32.9% reached “Very Satisfactory,” only 8.6% scored in the “Excellent”

category. This implies adequate pedagogical preparation but highlights the need to enhance competencies in higher-order teaching skills particularly in areas such as assessment and differentiated instruction [10].

Performance in the Field of Specialization showed wider variability: 39.4% rated “Very Satisfactory,” but 25.8% were in the “Fair” range and 3% fell into “Poor.” These inconsistencies suggest gaps in the alignment between undergraduate specialization training and LET expectations [7].

Taken collectively, 77.1% of respondents performed above the passing threshold, affirming the adequacy of institutional preparation. However, the relatively low proportion of “Excellent” performers across components signals the need for targeted curriculum improvements. These may include differentiated

review programs and intensified focus on content mastery, especially in specialization and pedagogy. This implies that outcome-based curricular enhancements aligned with LET domains are essential to elevate licensure success and professional readiness [25], [35].

5. Predictors of Respondents’ Performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers

Table VII

ANOVA results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p-value
6	Regression	564.843	13	43.449	4.040	.000 ^b
	Residual	602.291	56	10.755		
	Total	1167.134	69			

a. Dependent variable: LET Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), demographic profile, academic profile, Educational Attributes, family support, peer support, community and environment, institutional support

Table VII shows the ANOVA results examining the combined effect of several variables, demographic profile, academic profile, educational attributes, family support, peer support, community and environment, and institutional support on Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) performance. The model yielded a statistically significant F-value of 4.040 ($p = .000$), indicating that these factors, taken together, significantly predict licensure outcomes.

These findings affirm the multifactorial nature of LET performance, echoing prior research that highlights the interplay of academic, socio-emotional, and institutional influences on teacher readiness.

Both academic preparation and social support enhance licensure success [28], as well as structured institutional interventions [22]. Similarly, educational attributes such as persistence and pedagogical engagement as key contributors to exam performance [11].

Table VIII

Predictors of the Licensure Examination for Teachers’ Performance

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	p-value	Decision
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
(Constant)	86.591	4.604		18.809	.000	Ho rejected
Age	-.116	.137	-.102	-.848	.399	
Civil Status	-2.894	1.036	-.321	-2.793	.007	
1 Monthly Income prior to taking the LET	-.010	.587	-.002	-.017	.986	
AACUP Accreditation Level of the Program	1.974	.514	.422	3.839	.000	
Grade Point Average (GPA)	-.004	.051	-.010	-.084	.933	
Attendance to LET Review Classes	4.111	1.042	.432	3.946	.000	
Attendance to Final Coaching	3.526	.952	.410	3.705	.000	

Attendance to Pre/Mock Exam	4.660	.855	.551	5.451	.000
Education Attributes	.958	.727	.158	1.318	.192
Family Support	.447	.497	.108	.899	.372
Peer Support	.871	.502	.206	1.736	.087
Community and Environment	1.120	.470	.278	2.382	.020
Institutional Support	1.075	.454	.276	2.368	.021

- a. *Dependent Variable: LET Performance*
- b. *Model: $R = .102^a, R^2 = .010, Std. Error = 4.121$*
- c. *Predictors: (Constant), demographic profile, academic profile, Educational Attributes, family support, peer support, community and environment, institutional support*
- d. *Regression equation model: $y_1 = 86.591 - 2.894(Civil\ Status) + 1.974(AACCUP\ Accreditation\ Level\ of\ the\ Program) - 4.111(Attendance\ to\ LET\ Review\ Classes) - 3.526(Attendance\ to\ Final\ Coaching) - 4.660(Attendance\ to\ Pre/Mock\ Exam) + 1.120(Community\ and\ Environment) + 1.075(Institutional\ Support) + 4.121(Std.\ Error)$*

Table VIII illustrates a multiple regression analysis identifying key predictors of performance on the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) among teacher education graduates. The model reveals that civil status, program accreditation level, participation in LET preparatory activities, community environment, and institutional support significantly influence LET outcomes, collectively contributing to the model’s predictive validity ($R^2 = .010$). Other variables such as age, monthly income, GPA, educational attributes, family support, and peer support were not statistically significant.

Notably, civil status negatively predicted LET performance ($\beta = -0.321, p = .007$), suggesting that married or partnered examinees may encounter additional personal responsibilities that detract from exam preparation. This finding implies the balancing challenges faced by examinees managing familial obligations alongside academic demands [29]. Conversely, the AACCUP accreditation level of the academic program emerged as a strong positive predictor ($\beta = 0.422, p < .001$), underscoring the critical role of institutional quality assurance in enhancing graduate competence and exam readiness [8].

Participation in LET preparatory activities including review classes ($\beta = 0.432, p < .001$), final coaching sessions ($\beta = 0.410, p < .001$), and pre/mock examinations ($\beta = 0.551, p < .001$) also significantly predicted performance. These findings corroborate previous studies highlighting the effectiveness of targeted review programs in boosting test performance [11], [3].

Additionally, both community and environmental factors ($\beta = 0.278, p = .020$) and institutional support ($\beta = 0.276, p = .021$) were significant positive predictors. This affirms earlier research studies which demonstrated how supportive social environments and well-resourced institutional frameworks enhance learner motivation, access to critical resources, and ultimately exam success. Variables such as age, monthly income, GPA, educational attributes, family support, and peer support were not significant predictors, suggesting their influence on LET performance may be indirect or moderated by other factors within this model [23], [26].

These findings highlight the multifactorial nature of LET success and emphasize the importance of combining high-quality academic programs, proactive engagement in review activities, and robust social and institutional support mechanisms. This comprehensive approach supports recommendations advocating for outcome-based curricular reforms paired with holistic student support to optimize licensure examination performance and professional readiness [10], [35].

III. CONCLUSION

This study highlights the complex interplay of factors affecting the licensure examination performance of teacher education graduates. Key findings indicate that the accreditation level of the academic program, active engagement in LET preparatory activities, and supportive community and institutional environments significantly enhance licensure outcomes. Meanwhile, civil status was identified as a negative

predictor, suggesting that additional personal responsibilities may hinder exam preparation for some candidates. Moreover, variables such as age, income, GPA, and familial or peer support points to their more indirect or context-dependent influence on licensure success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers humbly extend their deepest gratitude to the teacher education graduates who generously shared their time and effort as respondents of this study, to the faculty and colleagues whose valuable insights and unwavering encouragement greatly contributed to its completion, and to the panel of examiners for their thoughtful comments and constructive guidance that enriched and enhanced this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Abar and E. Loken, "Self-regulated learning and academic achievement in college students," *Learning and Individual Differences*, vol. 82, p. 101912, 2020.
- [2] M. Ahmed, M. A. Khan, and M. Rizwan, "Time management strategies and exam performance: A study among teacher education students," *Int. J. Educ. Res. Open*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 100198, 2023.
- [3] R. Ahmed, M. Santos, and J. Lopez, "The effectiveness of structured review programs on licensure examination performance: A meta-analysis," *J. Teach. Educ. Res.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 45–62, 2023.
- [4] A. F. Al-Alwan, "The role of parental and peer support in students' academic achievement: A comparative study," *Educ. Urban Soc.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 263–284, 2021.
- [5] J. C. Amanonce and A. Maramag, "Licensure examination performance and academic achievement of teacher education graduates," *Int. J. Eval. Res. Educ.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 510–516, 2020.
- [6] L. Antiojo, "Performance of education graduates in the licensure examination for teachers (LET)," *PEOPLE: Int. J. Soc. Sci.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 1363–1384, 2017.
- [7] J. Cabrera and L. Santos, "Alignment of field specialization curricula with LET standards: Challenges and recommendations," *Asia-Pac. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 33–47, 2023.
- [8] L. Cruz, R. Mendoza, and P. Tan, "Institutional accreditation and its impact on teacher education graduates' licensure success," *Philipp. J. High. Educ.*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 120–134, 2022.
- [9] O. B. Figuerres, "An analysis of the performance of the University of Northern Philippines in the licensure examination for teachers," *IAMURE Int. J. Educ.*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2013.
- [10] A. L. Flores and L. P. Cagasan, "Academic persistence and performance in teacher licensure exams: A pedagogical engagement perspective," *Philipp. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 45–60, 2021.
- [11] G. Flores and C. Cagasan, "Pedagogical engagement and licensure examination performance: Insights from Filipino teacher education graduates," *Asia-Pac. J. Educ.*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 375–389, 2021.
- [12] L. Flores and M. Cagasan, "Enhancing pedagogical competencies in teacher education: Assessment and differentiated instruction focus," *Philipp. J. Educ. Pract.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 45–60, 2021.
- [13] G. Garcia, "Academic performance as determinant to pass the licensure examination for teachers," *JPAIR Inst. Res.*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2013.
- [14] M. T. Garcia and L. Palar-Calmorin, "Family support and academic performance among education students: A correlational study," *J. Educ. Psychol. Pract.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 102–112, 2023.
- [15] X. Jia and L. Cheng, "Perceived teacher support and student engagement among higher education students: A systematic literature review," *BMC Psychol.*, 2025.
- [16] R. Kausar, "Study habits and academic achievement among university students," *J. Educ. Psychol. Stud.*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 87–94, 2021.
- [17] R. Manalang and V. Santos, "Foundational knowledge and its impact on LET success: A correlational study," *J. Teach. Educ. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 15–28, 2022.
- [18] A. Maramag, J. C. Amanonce, and C. Temporal, "School profile and licensure examination performance of teacher education graduates in Northern Philippines," *Asia-Pac. J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 38–46, 2020.

- [19] S. Pachejo and A. Wendelyn, “Academic predictors of the licensure examination for teachers’ performance of the Rizal Technological University teacher education graduates,” *Int. J. Educ. Res. Technol.*, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 31–40, 2013.
- [20] E. Panadero, “A review of self-regulated learning: Six models and four directions for research,” *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 8, p. 422, 2017.
- [21] M. Pascua and A. Dalida, “Enhancing LET performance through community-based interventions: A Philippine case study,” *Philipp. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 45–58, 2023.
- [22] A. M. Pascual and R. C. Gonzales, “Institutional predictors of board examination success among education graduates,” *Asia-Pac. J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 88–96, 2021.
- [23] A. Pascual and V. Gonzales, “Institutional support and student success in licensure exams: Evidence from Philippine universities,” *Educ. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 234–249, 2021.
- [24] M. Pascual and L. Gonzales, “Curriculum responsiveness to licensure examinations: An outcome-based approach,” *Educ. Res. Southeast Asia*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 70–85, 2021.
- [25] M. Pascual and L. Gonzales, “Predictors of LET performance among pre-service teachers: Implications for curriculum review,” *Asia-Pac. J. Multidiscip. Res.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 35–42, 2021.
- [26] J. Perez and M. Lazo, “Environmental and community factors in student academic achievement: A study on teacher candidates,” *J. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 115, no. 2, pp. 190–205, 2023.
- [27] M. Rahimi and F. H. Karkami, “The role of academic motivation in test performance: A meta-analytic approach,” *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 35, pp. 509–530, 2023.
- [28] J. M. Reyes and M. R. Cruz, “Social support and academic resilience as predictors of licensure exam outcomes,” *Int. J. Educ. Res. Stud.*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 101–115, 2022.
- [29] K. Santos and J. Rivera, “Balancing family and academic responsibilities: Challenges for licensure examination candidates,” *J. Educ. Res. Pract.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 75–89, 2023.
- [30] Q. Truong, N. Le, and T. Pham, “Time management and academic stress among preservice teachers: A Vietnamese context,” *Teach. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 111, p. 103621, 2022.
- [31] M. J. Van Ryzin and C. J. Roseth, “Peer learning and student achievement: A meta-analysis of peer intervention studies,” *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 29, p. 100306, 2020.
- [32] K. L. Velasco and A. P. Buan, “Strengthening external support systems in teacher education: A multi-stakeholder approach,” *Asia-Pac. J. Educ. Policy*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 29–48, 2024.
- [33] L. Wu, X. Tan, and Y. Liu, “Study skills, self-regulation, and academic success in licensure exams,” *Educ. Train.*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp. 203–217, 2022.
- [34] A. Bandura, *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York, NY, USA: W. H. Freeman, 1997.
- [35] Commission on Higher Education (CHED), *CHED Memorandum Order No. 10, Series of 2023: Policy on Outcome-Based Teacher Education Curriculum Enhancements*. Quezon City, Philippines: CHED Central Office, 2023.
- [36] Commission on Higher Education (CHED), *Policy Framework for Licensure-Responsive Teacher Education Programs (CHED Memorandum Order No. 15)*. Quezon City, Philippines: CHED Central Office, 2023.
- [37] J. Mateo, “Teacher performance in board exams worsening,” *The Philippine Star*, Philippines, 2017.