

# Performance on Licensure Examination for Teachers Between Education and Non-Education Graduates from One State College

Asia Pacific Journal of  
Multidisciplinary Research  
Vol. 8 No.2, 86-93  
May 2020  
P-ISSN 2350-7756  
E-ISSN 2350-8442  
www.apjmr.com  
ASEAN Citation Index

Mary Grace M. Ofqueria (PhD)

Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology, Old Sagay,  
Sagay City, Negros Occidental, Philippines  
mofqueria@yahoo.com

Date Received: October 17, 2019; Date Revised: April 22, 2020

*Abstract –One hundred percent passing percentage in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) is the aspiration of every Teacher Education Institutions for its graduates. During pre-service education, pre-service teachers are made to engage on rigid trainings, seminars and field exposures aligned to Policies Standards and Guidelines of the Commission on Higher Education. This resulted to average performance of BSEd first takers in the LET while below passing among non-education takers. The study determined the differences in the performance on the licensure examination for teachers of Education and Non-Education graduates of a state college in the Philippines. The respondents of the study were the 461 first takers in the LET both passers and non-passers from March 2014 to September 2018 of whom 283 were graduates of Bachelor of Secondary Education and 178 were Non-Education Graduates from the same institution. Total enumeration was adopted in the study. A secondary data from Professional Regulatory Commission in the three areas as General Education, Professional Education and Specialization were analyzed. Findings revealed that Education graduates performed better in General Education and Professional Education but weak in Specialization while the Non-education graduates have low rating performance in all the three areas covered by the board examination. Comparing the performances of the two groups in General Education, Education graduates got above average while non-education was below passing, Professional Education, Education graduates was average whereas Non-education was below passing while in Specialization, both have below passing rating. For its over-all performance, Education obtained an average rating while Non-education got below passing rating. Data imply that the below passing performance of Non-Education in the board examination contributed to the low performance of the College in the LET. Thus, the curriculum of non-education be revisited, non-education performance maybe separated from BSEd, and assess instructions' alignment to LET competencies especially in specialization.*

*Keywords –Curriculum, Education Graduates, Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), Non-Education Graduates, State College*

## INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions strive for quality and excellence. One of the performance indicators to prove this is the school's performance in the licensure examination, according to Accrediting Agency of Chartered Colleges and Universities of the Philippines (AACCUP) it should be 25% higher than the national passing percentage, a concrete evidence that a Teacher Education Institution (TEI) is performing well in the area of instruction, one of the fourfold functions of State Universities and Colleges (SUC's). A high performance rating in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) is the ultimate aim of NONESCOST, College of Education but for some

years already it obtained an over-all passing rates which are not so remarkable though several interventions were implemented already. The College takers in the board examination were not only the BS Education graduates but there were an increasing number of takers graduated from other programs within the institution who took units in education and qualify to take the licensure examination. Questions arose if the low performance of the College is solely because of BSEd graduates performance from the College of Education or does the LET performance of Non-education graduates on the same institution have a significant effect on the LET results, hence this study is conducted. Salundaguit [1] discovered that

BSEd first takers performance in the LET was higher than the national passing percentage while the non-education takers were below passing rating that pulls down the College over-all performance in the LET. In this regard, TEI's, CHED and PRC should revisit the curriculum, course requirements and policies for non-education takers in the LET and considering into the possibility of separating BSEd performance from non-education takers.

The Teacher Education Institution (TEI) is responsible for the crafting of the curriculum for Teacher Education Program which in turn approved by the College Board of Trustees and confirmed by the Commission on Higher Education, it is guided by Policies, Standards and Guidelines (PSG's) of the CHED known as the CMO No.30, s.2004 for the old curriculum [2] and CMO No. 75, s. 2017 for the new curriculum for Bachelor of Secondary Education [3]. There are TEI's that offers Certificate in Teaching and Diploma in Teaching, while others are still implementing the eighteen units in education which is legal according to Republic Act 7836 known as the LET Law [4]. Graduates from four or five year degree courses are qualified to enrol in these short term courses depending on the admission policy of the particular institution. The offering of these programs is in accordance with CMO No. 52 s.2007 [5]. It is stipulated in this CHED Memorandum Order the competencies a pre-service teacher needs to master in order to pass the licensure examination as well as on becoming a teacher.

Passing the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) in three areas such as General Education, Professional Education and Specialization takes a lot of trainings and preparation during pre-service education which is vital in achieving quality instruction. As stipulated in the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers [6] it states that outstanding performance of learners in school and classroom activities is a product of teacher's competence as the principle of sowing and reaping, good teachers produces good learners. Once the exam was passed, the LET passer either Education or Non-education is now allowed to practice the teaching profession as prescribed in the Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994. According to David Ausubel Meaningful Learning Theory [7], success takes place when a learner has already the prior knowledge on things being taught and learned in school and somewhat relevant to one's career path. With this, non-education should receive trainings

and observe polices same with the BSEd graduates during pre-service education for a greater chance of obtaining positive result in the LET exam.

#### **OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

This study sought answers regarding the performance of Education and Non-Education graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers from March 2014 to September 2018 in the three areas as General Education, Professional Education and Specialization. The performances of the two groups in the three areas covered by the LET were further analysed to find out its significant differences.

#### **METHODS**

The research utilized the descriptive method using the secondary data from the Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC). Variables include general education, professional education and specialization rating in the Licensure Examination for Teachers [8].

The researcher requested the performance rating of NONESCOST LET takers in the three areas from the Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC), Manila, through on-line means.

With the data from PRC, the NONESCOST takers were classified into two, the Education graduates if they were graduates from the College of Education and the Non-education graduates if they graduated from other departments within the school system. This was further verified from the list of graduates issued by the College Registrar. The study was limited to the first takers of Education and Non-education graduates both passers and non-passers.

The respondents of the study were the LET takers of NONESCOST from March 2014 to September 2018. Specifically these are the Bachelor of Secondary Education graduates and the graduates from other programs offered by the College, the Non-education graduates. These graduates have earned 30 units in education equivalent to Certificate in Teaching or 36 units for Diploma in Teaching while others took 18 units in education from other TEI's to be qualified in the LET.

A total of 461 first takers in the LET from March 2014 to September 2018 schedule of examinations were identified based on the data from the PRC. Two hundred eighty three (283) of whom were Education graduates and 178 were Non-education graduates. Total enumeration was adopted in the study, a non-probability sampling.

The quantitative secondary data from March 2014 to September 2018 LET takers obtained from the Professional Regulatory Commission were subjected to statistical test. To determine the performance of education and non-education takers in the LET, mean and standard deviation were used, for the comparison of LET performance in General Education, Professional Education and Specialization, ANOVA and post hoc were used and independent sample T-test was used when testing the differences of performance of Education and Non-education graduates.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The study covers Education and Non-education graduates and both were first takers. There were 283 Education and 178 Non-education takers in the LET. Comparing the data in terms of number of takers, there was a higher number of takers from the Non-education graduates during March schedule of examination that started in March 2015 which affected the low performance of the College while most of the Education graduates took the examination in the September schedule. Thus, the College may look for possible solution through the Academic Council because in SUC levelling, Performance Based Bonus (PBB) and Collective Negotiating Agreement (CNA) the results from the two examinations given every year were computed as performance indicators under licensure examinations.

In March 2014 schedule of examination, Education takers failed in General Education, Professional

Education and Specialization, in September 2014 LET, only the Professional Education got a mean score of 75.01 which is average performance rating while failed in general education and specialization.

Starting September 2015 up to September 2018, there was a gradual increase of performance in the board examination especially in general education and professional education. September 2016 Education got above average rating of 83.68 in general education, average for professional education with a rating of 77.44 and failed in specialization. March 2017, the group obtained an above average performance in general education of 84.75 and professional education of 82.38 and average for specialization of 76. September 2017, they got excellent performance in general education a rating of 85.21, above average in professional education which is 81.46 but failed in specialization.

In March 2018, the group got above average performance for general education and professional education but again failed in specialization. And in September 2018, the group got an excellent performance of 85.15 in general education, above average of 80.90 for professional education while average performance of 76 for specialization. The group has an over-all performance from March 2014 to September 2018 of 80.50 an above average performance for general education, average for professional education but failed in specialization.

**Table 1. Performance of Education Graduates LET Takers both Passers and Non-passers from March 2014 to September 2018**

Area	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		Overall Performance n=283
	M n=23	S n=88	M n=3	S n=26	M n=5	S n=41	M n=8	S n=24	M n=4	S n=61	
GenEd	72.13	74.97	78.33	79.88	78.60	83.68	84.75	85.21	82.25	85.15	<b>80.50</b>
ProfEd	72.74	75.01	72.66	78.69	78.20	77.44	82.38	81.46	80.00	80.90	<b>77.95</b>
Spec	68.57	71.07	69.67	71.12	72.60	71.49	76.00	73.29	72.75	76.00	<b>72.26</b>
<b>Overall Performance</b>	<b>71.15</b>	<b>73.68</b>	<b>73.55</b>	<b>76.56</b>	<b>76.47</b>	<b>77.54</b>	<b>81.04</b>	<b>79.79</b>	<b>78.33</b>	<b>80.68</b>	<b>76.90</b>

(M=March, S=September) Below 75 = Failed, 75-79 = Average, 80-84=Above Average, 85 and Above =Excellent

**Table 2. Performance of Non-Education Graduates LET Takers both Passers and Non-passers from March 2014 to September 2018**

Area	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		Overall Performance n=178
	M n=12	S n=25	M n=11	S n=26	M n=16	S n=23	M n=10	S n=10	M n=27	S n=18	
GenEd	70.42	65.04	70.27	72.50	74.06	68.22	72.70	79.00	74.56	77.00	<b>72.38</b>
ProfEd	72.75	63.68	69.45	70.23	69.94	60.52	68.40	76.20	67.41	74.00	<b>69.26</b>
Spec	68.83	69.92	76.00	75.08	70.69	63.74	63.90	71.30	66.52	67.78	<b>69.38</b>
<b>Overall Performance</b>	<b>70.67</b>	<b>66.22</b>	<b>71.91</b>	<b>72.60</b>	<b>71.56</b>	<b>64.18</b>	<b>68.33</b>	<b>75.50</b>	<b>69.50</b>	<b>72.93</b>	<b>70.34</b>

(M=March, S=September) Below 75 = Failed, 75-79 = Average, 80-84=Above Average, 85 and Above = Excellent

As a whole, the group has an over-all performance rating of 76.90 interpreted as average in the 3 areas covered by the LET. Through this data, could it be possible that PRC will separate the performance of BSEd from non-education takers in the LET? Results obtained can be linked to the study conducted by Antonio, Malvar and Ferrer [9] where LET takers performed satisfactorily in general education and professional education but got a low passing rating in specialization. Data suggests the need to conduct root cause analysis to identify factors causing low performance in specialization.

In terms of performance of Non-education LET takers, the group got failed ratings in General Education, Professional Education and Specialization in 2014 March and September examination.

In March 2015, they got failed in general education and professional education while an average performance of 76 in specialization. For September 2015, they failed again in general education and professional education an average rating of 75.08 in specialization. September 2016 and March 2017, the group failed in the 3 areas. For September 2017, they got average performance of 79 for general education, average of 76.20 for professional education and failed in specialization. In March 2018, the group again failed in the 3 areas. And in September 2018, it has an average performance of 77 in general education but failed in professional education and specialization.

The non-education over-all performance in the 3 areas of the LET is 70.34 interpreted as failed. The below passing performance rating of this group could be attributed to the lack of academic preparation reveals in the study of Mohammed and Muhammed [10]. Findings suggest the need to revisit the curriculum and course requirements of non-education takers in the LET. According to Ivan Pavlov, Classical Conditioning Theory [11], conditioned variables control the behavior of the person that can be achieved through practice. It could be that their failed performance due to insufficient trainings whom BSEd exposed to during pre-service education in preparation for the LET where the process of conditioning someone's attitude is very important to achieve success. Their low performance affected the College over-all performance in the LET.

It can be gleaned from Table 3 that among the three areas covered in the LET, General Education has the highest mean, followed by Professional Education while Specialization has the lowest mean. Findings could be link to instruction's alignment in preparation

for the test with the LET competencies of PRC while Specialization which has the lowest mean could be attributed to competencies in the LET that were not mastered in the duration of the course. De Guzman [12] findings revealed that once competencies are not mastered it's impossible to get the correct response. With a p value of  $.000 < .05$  level of significance, data reveals that there was a highly significant difference in the performance of Education graduates in the three areas.

**Table 3. Comparison of LET Performance of Education Graduates in General Education, Professional Education and Specialization**

Areas	Mean	SD	df	f-value	p.
GenEd	80.50	6.86	2	78.85*	.000
ProfEd	77.95	5.53			
Specialization	72.26	7.35			

\*\*Highly Significant at  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$

A further analysis of data was done through the use of post hoc in Table 4 to find out what area/s in the LET where significant difference lies.

**Table 4. Post Hoc Analysis of LET Performance of Education Graduates of NONESCOST in the three areas identified**

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
GenEd	ProfEd	1.58210*	.58501	.007
	Specialization	6.85830**	.58262	.000
ProfEd	Specialization	5.27620**	.55875	.000

\*Significant at  $p\text{-value} < 0.05$ ; \*\*Highly Significant at  $p\text{-value} < 0.01$

Data revealed that there is a significant difference between General Education and Professional Education with a level of significance of  $.007$  which is  $< .05$ . There is a highly significant difference between General Education and Specialization with a level of significance of  $.000 < .05$ . There is also a highly significant difference between Professional Education and Specialization with a level of significance of  $.000 < .05$ . This could mean that there are differences in the performance ratings of Education takers in the 3 areas covered by the LET. Data signify that BSEd takers find Professional Education and Specialization difficult than General Education which is in consonance to the study of Antiojo [13] that findings reflect the manner in the delivery of instruction and difficulty of subject or course where level of competencies mastered in

General Education are not the same with Professional Education and Specialization and further revealed that Professional Education and Specialization are the areas in the LET where examination takers find difficulty.

**Table 5. Comparison of LET Performance of Non-Education Graduates in General Education, Professional Education and Specialization**

Areas	Mean	SD	df	ANOVA	p.
GenEd	72.38	10.35	2	5.525*	.004
ProfEd	69.26	10.45			
Specialization	69.38	10.75			

*Below 75 = Failed, 75-79 = Average, 80-84=Above Average; \* Significant at p-value<0.05*

As reflected in Table 5, the mean of non-education graduates in General Education, Professional Education and Specialization was lower than 75. Data shows that the group got below passing performance in the LET, this signify that LET competencies are not mastered by non-education. The study hypothesized that there was a significant difference on the performance of non-education in the three areas identified. The low performance of non-education takers in the LET can be supported by the study of Delos Angeles [14] where lack of preparations and mastery of competencies needed in the LET may give a failing performance rating.

The data was further analyzed in Table 6 using post hoc to find out what areas significant difference lies.

**Table 6. Post Hoc Analysis of LET Performance of Non-Education Graduates of NONESCOST in the three areas identified**

(I) group	(J) group	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
GenEd	ProfEd	3.56742*	1.11471	.001
	Specialization	2.65169*	1.11471	.018
ProfEd	Specialization	-.91573*	1.11471	.412

*\*Significant at p-value<0.05*

As shown in the data, there was a significant difference between the performance of non-education graduates in General Education and Professional Education the level of significance was  $.001 < .05$ . There was a significant difference between General Education and Specialization with  $.018$  level of significance  $< .05$ . But there was no significant difference between Professional Education and Specialization for  $.412$  level of significance  $> .05$ . Data

indicate that the level of competencies mastered by non-education in general education is not the same in professional education as well as in specialization whereas level of competencies mastered in professional education somewhat the same in specialization.

The differences in the performance rating of general education to professional education and specialization could be linked to students' preparation especially for general education considering that it is more on stocked knowledge. According to David Ausubel (cited [7]), when a learner has already the prior knowledge it will be easy for him/her to connect or understand new concept or ideas, there is a higher possibility of getting the correct answer.

**Table 7. Comparison of LET Performance of Education and Non-Education in General Education**

Source of Comparison	Mean	SD	T-test	p.
Education	80.90	6.58	-11.036	.000
Non-Education	72.38	10.35		

*\*\*Highly Significant at p-value<0.01*

Comparing the results of education and non-education in General Education, with the p value of  $.000 < .05$  it was interpreted that there was a highly significant difference in the performance of the two groups. As a whole, Education takers performed better in General Education with its performance rating as above average while the non-education got a below passing rating. The above average performance rating of Education takers could be due to several interventions employed by the College of Education especially on the strict implementation of admission and retention policy and can be supported by the study conducted by Dagdag, Sarmiento and Ibale [15], that strict adherence to admission and retention policy can help improve performance in the LET. With this, it could be possible that if there is no strict implementation of admission and retention policy among non-education programs the moment their graduates plan to take units in education after graduation its probability of passing the LET is small.

In the area of Professional Education, education has a mean of 77.95 while the non-education has a mean of 69.26 with a p value of  $.000 < .05$  level of significance. The difference in the performance between the two groups was highly significant. As a whole, Education got an average rating while Non-

education got below passing rating in Professional Education.

**Table 8. Comparison of LET Performance of Education and Non-Education in Professional Education**

Source of Comparison	Mean	SD	T-test	p.
Education	77.95	5.47	-13.278	.000
Non-Education	69.26	10.45		

*\*\*Highly Significant at p-value < 0.01*

The significant difference in the performance of the two (2) groups in professional education could be supported by the study of Laganao [16], where BSEd LET takers find difficulty in Professional Education area. If BSEd LET takers has difficulty in this area whose units in Professional Education is 51 it could be possible that more difficulty is encountered by non-education who have only 18 units in education which already qualify them to take the teachers board exam since it is stipulated in Republic Act 7836, hence, must be considered by curriculum experts and other involved in the teacher education program especially BSEd program. Thus, the below passing performance of non-education in professional education can be further supported by Delos Angeles (cited, [14]) that lack of trainings and exposure during pre-service education can lead to failed performance.

**Table 9. Comparison of LET Performance of Education and Non-Education in Specialization**

Source of Comparison	Mean	SD	T-test	p.
Education	72.26	5.47	-13.278	.000
Non-Education	69.38	10.45		

*\*\*Highly Significant at p-value < 0.01*

The mean of Education takers in specialization was 72.26 while the Non-education was 69.38 that gave the p value of .000 < .05 level of significance and interpreted as highly significant difference between Education and Non-education graduates performance in the area identified. In this area, both the two groups were not able to reach the 75% cut-off score in the LET which means that they failed in this area. The below passing performance rating in specialization indicates that there were competencies in the LET not mastered by takers which can be observed to the results in the study conducted by Antonio, Malvar and Ferrer [9] as revealed also in the findings of Mohammed and Muhammed [10] where lack of

mastery of competencies could lead to a failed performance. It could be possible that competencies taught in this area are not aligned to LET competencies.

For this area, BSEd is required for 60 units or more as stipulated in CMO No. 30, s.2004 while not required anymore among non-education.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The Bachelor of Secondary Education performance in the LET from March 2014 to September 2018 is above average in General Education, Professional Education is average and Specialization is below passing rating. There was a significant difference between BSEd LET results in the 3 areas covered by the examination.

The Non-Education got below passing rating in the examination from March 2014 to September 2018. For General Education it is below passing rating, Professional Education below passing rating and Specialization still below passing rating. Among Non-education results significantly differ between general education and professional education and between general education and specialization.

It was revealed also that a high number of Non-Education takers compared to BSEd takers in March schedule of examination where its performance is below passing.

As a whole there was a highly significant difference between the performances of the 2 groups in General Education, where Education got above average while failed for Non-education for Professional Education, Education got average whereas Non-education got failed and both got failed in Specialization, the area that needs further investigation. For its over-all performance in the 3 areas of the LET, Education got average while Non-education got failed. Through the findings, by comparing its over-all performance it is concluded that BSEd performed better than Non-education in the LET.

Therefore, the below performance and the higher number of Non-Education takers of the college in the LET specifically in March have contributed to the low performance of the College in the Licensure Examination for Teachers.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The College of Education of NONESCOST through the support of the Academic Council may work hand in hand for the improvement of the licensure examination performance. Several practices already

implemented by the college such as strengthening the admission and retention policy should be continued. As the trend in the schedule of examinations by PRC shows, there was an increasing number of Non-education takers in the LET especially in March and their performance were low. Thus, the low performance of the non-education graduates contributed to the low performance of the College. With this, NONESCOST Guidance Center may craft a standard in admitting students to Non-education programs.

Through the result of the study, may the Professional Regulatory Commission (PRC) consider the request of some Teacher Education Institutions who have experienced the same problem to separate the performance of Education graduates from the Non-education graduates in the LET. Curriculum planners may give attention to enhance the curriculum of Teacher Certificate Program.

The free LET in-house review conducted by the college should be given not only to Education graduates but also to Non-education graduates who plan to take the LET. It was observed also that there was a low performance rating in the area of specialization, which shows the need for a regular curriculum review, specifically in the arrangement of major subject offerings, the course syllabi content prepared by the faculty whether competencies in the LET are integrated and its alignment to the Table of Specification and Examination are being considered. It is strongly recommended that LET review should still be embedded in the BSEd curriculum. NONESCOST hiring committee through its Promotion and Selection Board (PSB) may strengthen the hiring of faculty especially those in the field of specialization.

Since the study focused only between the first takers performance of education and non-education graduates in the 3 areas covered by the LET from one state college it is recommended that other Universities and Colleges that offer programs aside from Teacher Education Program may conduct a study comparing the performances of BSEd and Non-education both first takers and re-takers to further validate the findings of this study. A study on factors affecting low performance especially in the area of specialization as well as predictors in the licensure examination may also be conducted.

## REFERENCES

[1] Salundaguit, D.F. T. (2018). Education, Second Courser, and non-College of Education Graduate's

- Performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers of JRMSU-TC SY 2013-2016. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research*, 34, url: <http://philair.ph/publication/index.php/jpair/article/view/633/1408>
- [2] CMO No.30, s. 2004 by Commission on Higher Education
- [3] CMO No. 75, s. 2017 by Commission on Higher Education
- [4] Republic Act 7836, Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994
- [5] CMO No. 52, s. 2007 by Commission on Higher Education
- [6] Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (2017). Department of Education – Teacher Education Council
- [7] <https://cimtprelims.fandom.com/wiki/AusubelMeaningfulLearningTheory>, Subsumption Theory, %26 Motivational Theory, Ausubel Meaningful Learning Theory
- [8] Licensure Examination for Professional Teachers – Secondary of Northern Negros State College of Science and Technology
- [9] Antonio, J. F., Malvar R. J., Ferrer, M. B. (2016). Licensure Examination for Teachers Results from 2010 to 2013 of PUP San Pedro's Bachelor in Secondary Education Major in Mathematics and English Graduates and its Relationship on their Academic Performance, *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(4) , url: <http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/APJMR-2016.7.4.4.03.pdf>
- [10] Mohammed, M. P. & Muhammed, M. P. (2017). Licensure Examination Performance Evaluation of the Candidate Engineers as Basis for a Proposed Action Plan, *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research* 5(2). url: <http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/APJMR-2017.5.2.06.pdf>
- [11] Clark, R. (2004). The Classical Origins of Pavlov's Conditioning, Research Gate, University of California, San Diego, url: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/7472370TheClassicalOriginsOfPavlovsConditioning>
- [12] De Guzman, A. B. (2003). The Dynamics of Educational Reforms in the Philippine Basic and Higher Education Sectors. *Education Research Institute* 4(1). url: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ776349.pdf>
- [13] Antiojo, L. P. (2015). Performance of Education Graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), *PEOPLE: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(2). url: <https://grdspublishing.org/index.php/people/article/view/675>
- [14] Delos Angeles, M. G. (2019). Correlates of Performance in the Licensure Examination for

- Teachers, *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(2). url: <http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/upload/2019/05/APJMR-2019.7.2.2.07.pdf>
- [15] Dagdag, J. D., Sarmiento, C. S., Ibale, J. C. (2017). Examining the Factors of Licensure Examination for Teachers Performance for Program Strategy Enhancement, *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(4), url: <http://www.apjmr.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/APJMR-2017.5.4.2.05.pdf>
- [16] Laganao, E. (2017). In Focus: College of Education Graduates Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) Performance, *Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities Research*, 3(1). url: <http://jsshr.anveshika.org/article/in-focus-college-of-education-graduates-licensure-examination-for-teachers-let-performance/>

#### **COPYRIGHTS**

Copyright of this article is retained by the author/s, with first publication rights granted to APJMR. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4>).