Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review (2014), Vol. 5, 104-117

Exploring Formula for Success in Teachers' Licensure Examination in the Philippines

Maribel G. Gerundio
Marilyn U. Balagtas
Philippine Normal University

Abstract The study aimed to discover a formula for success in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) through analysis of its relationship with students' admission variables (high school grade point average and university admission test), academic variables (GPA in general, professional and specialization courses, and the overall grade in a teacher education program), and pre-board variables (general and professional education and overall pre-board score). Using the descriptive-correlational method, 286 pre-service teachers of a known Teacher Education Institution in the Philippines whose data were complete from entry to exit were qualified for analysis. 32% represents the pre-service teachers in two streams in BEED and 68% represents 15 specialization areas in the BSE program. Multiple regression using stepwise method was used to determine the best predictors of success in the LET. The results reveal that the significant predictors of success in passing the licensure examination for would-be elementary teachers include the performance in the admission test and professional education GPA. To the BSE, the same variables are significant predictors with the addition of the pre-board overall performance. Exploration of the best model led to formulas for greater likelihood of passing the LET.

Keywords: teacher education, licensure examination, predictors of success

Teacher Quality is the first and foremost goal of Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs). Ensuring a quality profile of teachers is an important role of the different education sectors, stakeholders, and the government. Quality education lies mainly on effective and highly qualified teachers. Research shows that teacher quality is one vital factor of student achievement (Hanushek, 2005; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2010; The WorldBank, 2010). Salandanan (2001) espoused that no single factor can contribute to an improved student achievement than the guarantee of a quality teacher in every classroom. No amount of classroom facilities and instructional materials can

produce the desired learning outcomes without a teacher at the center stage. Bilbao (2006) as cited in Montemayor, Roxas, and Panayon (2009) claimed that the relationship between good teaching and student achievement elevates the importance of teacher quality in the eyes of the parents, educators and policy makers.

The preparation of quality teachers is the first step towards building a quality teacher workforce. Efforts to generate consistently high teaching levels across all classrooms must begin with an articulated, widely accepted teacher preparation and support system that covers the entire spectrum of a teaching career (Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, 2000). As part of teacher preparation, teacher quality determines the success of education in the country.

The quality of teacher education programs and alternative teacher preparations has been the subject of debates and studies over many decades. In the Philippines, one gauge of the quality of the curricular program undertaken by the teacher applicants is their performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). One of the main qualifications of teachers is passing the LET. This is the only national assessment, which can be used to gauge the quality of outputs of TEIs.

In the Philippines, the Republic Act 7836, known as the "Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994" transferred the responsibility of Teacher Certification from the Civil Service Commission to the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) in 1996. From 1996 – 2008, the LET for graduates of Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd) and Bachelor of Secondary Education (BSE) has two common parts: General Education (GE) and Professional Education (PE). The BSE graduates, however, has a third test and that is their Specialization. In 2009, the LET for BEEd graduates also comprises of three parts: General Education, Professional Education and Specialization. The additional component was termed as Content Courses, which is in accordance with the requirements for elementary education curriculum under the CMO No. 30, series of 2004 issued by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) titled Revised Policies and Standards in Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum that took effect in school year 2005-2006.

The licensure examination in the Philippines serves then as a gauge of the effectiveness of the delivery of the teacher education curriculum completed by the teacher applicants and a quality assurance to those who enter the teaching profession. It is designed to protect the public by ensuring that graduates are allowed to practice the teaching profession after they have met the basic requirements of becoming a teacher. Performance in the LET is then one major indicator of quality and excellence.

In all LET results released by PRC, passing rates are usually below 50%. In the January 2014 results, for example, about 29% in both elementary and secondary education programs graduates passed the LET. In the report of the Philippine Business for Education (2013), the over-all national passing rate of the first takers in the LET in the last five years is 54%. In all these reports, the topnotch students and/or the TEI where they come from as well as the over-all

performance of TEIs in such examination are often made public. The LET as a national measure of quality of an institution in the country makes then every TEI either celebrate or worry. The high overall passing rate (OPR) in the LET becomes an indicator of high quality and standard of TEI. Passing the LET indicates that the graduates of a TEI acquire the minimum standards of competence expected of a teacher. Hermosisima (2003) considered it as an achievement test for the graduates of teacher education programs and thus presumed that those who are able to pass the LET have acquired the necessary knowledge and skills they were taught in pre-service training.

In this study, the performance in the LET of the sampled TEI has been investigated. This TEI, a case to study, has a record of outstanding performance in the country for being a top ranked TEI in producing the most number of graduates passing the LET (PBED, 2013) . It is also the only university in the Philippines that focuses on offering teacher education programs from undergraduate to doctoral levels. Republic Act No. 9647 also made this TEI the country's National Center for Teacher Education (NCTE). However, in spite of the excellent performance of this TEI in the LET, there is still the long-term goal of achieving the ideal 100% OPR for all its programs. Hence, this study has been conceived to determine the predictors of success of the students of this TEI in the LET under the new curriculum in order for the administration to have basis to further improve its program. As Whitcomb and Rose (2008) explained, one approach to understand teacher quality considers individual teacher qualifications and characteristics. Hopefully, the findings of the study will provide insightful implications for curriculum and instruction of the institution from entry to exit through the LET as basis for certification to the teaching profession.

It is in this light that this study was conducted in order to investigate the relationship of students' intellective variables such as students' entry data (admission variables), scholastic ratings (academic variables) and performance in the pre-board examination (pre-board variables) with LET performance. The admission variables refer to the high school grade point average (HS-GPA) of the teacher applicant and his/her performance in the institution's Admission Test (AT). Academic variables refer to the GPAs obtained in the general education, professional education and specialization courses in the teacher education program taken by the graduate. Pre-board variables refer to the teacher applicant's scores in the pre-board examination given by the institution in preparation for the LET, which provides scores in general and professional education and over-all. The study described the profile of the participants in the study from entry to exit from the institution. It also investigated the interrelationship that exists among the three groups of variables and the contribution of each to the variance in LET performance of the passers and the non-passers. After ascertaining the relationship that exists between each variable and LET performance, a formula for success in LET for each of the BEED and BSE examinees was formulated.

Method

The study made use of the descriptive-correlational method of research to analyze the relationships among the identified variables and to determine the predictors of performance in the LET. The sample of the study was comprised of 286 BEED and BSE graduates in the case TEI in school year 2009-2010 who took the LET in the same year they graduated. Initially, the researcher had a sample of 794. However, the sample size was reduced to 286 (36%) to consider only those with complete data from entry to exit in the case TEI as they are the needed variables in the study. Data analysis was done through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Vol. 16). Bivariate correlations were obtained to determine if a significant relationship exists between LET performance and each of the variables investigated. Multiple regression using stepwise procedure was utilized to find the most parsimonious set of predictors that are most effective in predicting the dependent variable to come up with a formula. The t-test for independent means was also computed to find out if a significant difference exists between the LET passers and non-passers in terms of the given variables to further validate the results of the multiple regression analysis done.

Method and Discussion

The mean HS-GPA of the participants is 87.94 with a standard deviation of 2.98. The participants generally have HS-GPA, which is much higher than 80%, the minimum grade required to entrants of the institution. Looking at the results by specialization program, it is interesting to note that the specialization courses selected by those who have a HS GPA above the mean were Chemistry (89.55), Biology (89.31), Mathematics (89.29), History (88.67), English (88.53), General Science (88.41), Psychology (88.37), and Physical Science (88.18). Those who have HS GPA below the mean were in the following courses: BEED (87.57), Filipino (87.38), BECED (86.91), Speech and Theater Arts (86. 98), Social Science (86.77), Information Technology (86.71), Home Economics (86.15), Physical Education (85.57) and Values Education (85.14).

One of the basic requirements to qualify a student to enroll in this institution is to pass its admissions test. According to Mancao and Orleans (2010), its 150-item admission test has three components: language skills, number skills, and predisposition to teaching. The sample as a whole did very well in the PNUAT since their obtained scores ranged from 87.50 to 104, with an over-all mean of 94.94 which is equivalent to 63% of the test. This is already considered high from a psychometric point of view as it is above 50%. This is not at all surprising since their academic ability gauged by their high school GPA is high. The admission mean score indicates that they have the minimum knowledge and cognitive skills required of those entering the teaching profession since they have answered correctly about 63% of what the admission test has covered. The admission performance explained by the entrance test score and GPA reveals that those who are entering the teacher

education programs of this institution have a strong foundation to succeed in their chosen profession.

Academic performance in college was determined primarily through their Grade Point Average (GPA). In the teacher education curricula for BEED and BSE, there were three areas for which the GPA was computed: general education, professional education, and specialization. To the BEED, their highest GPA is in professional education ($\bar{x}$=88.23, SD=1.31), then in their content courses or specialization ($\bar{x}$=88.10, SD=1.33), and then in general education ($\bar{x}$=86.21, SD=1.4) and an overall GPA of 87.36 with a standard deviation of 1.22. By specialization, the early childhood students got slightly lower GPAs in all the three areas compared to the content courses students. To the BSE participants, they also got the highest GPA in the professional education courses ($\bar{x}$= 88.07, SD=1.76), then in the general education ($\bar{x}$=86.59, SD=1.89) and then in their specialization ($\bar{x}$=86.25, SD=2.35) with an overall college GPA of 86.82 and a standard deviation of 1.58. By specialization, Chemistry majors got the highest GPA in general education ($\bar{x}$=88.23) while Home Economics majors got the lowest ($\bar{x}$=84.42); Biology majors got the highest GPA in professional education ($\bar{x}$=89.50) while Physical Education majors got the lowest ($\bar{x}$=84.70). The Home Economics majors, while getting the lowest in general education, they got the highest in specialization ($\bar{x}$=88.91).

The overall mean score of the sample in the pre-board examination is 100, which is 50% of the 200-item multiple choice test covering only their general and professional education courses. Half of the total test items were based on the general education (50.27%) and the rest come from the professional education (49.83%). This means that the participants were in the borderline in terms of passing the LET. However, when the sample was grouped by program, BSE students' performance ($\bar{x}$=106.95) was much higher than that of the BEED ($\bar{x}$=85.80) with 21.15 points or 10% difference. The BSE sample got more than 50% of the total number of test items, 51.02% in GenEd and 55.79% in ProfEd. However, the BEED graduates got failing scores in both components: 48.70% in GenEd and 37.27% in ProfEd. The results may have been caused by testing conditions not favorable to the examinees at the time the pre-board examination was administered (PNU, 2009).

The LET performance of the participants in the three components is a little closer to 80%. The BEED sample obtained an average mean score of a little closer to 80% in general education ($\bar{x}$=79.36), professional education ($\bar{x}$=79.25), and in their content courses ($\bar{x}$=78.74) with an overall mean LET score of 79.09 and a standard deviation of 3.12.

On the other hand, the BSE sample obtained an over-all mean score higher close to the BEED where their specialization courses ($\bar{x}$=80.26) and general education ($\bar{x}$=79.80) mean scores were higher than their professional education courses ($\bar{x}$=78.38). Looking closely at the LET results of different programs in BSE, those who scored higher in the LET are into the field of sciences and languages. On the contrary, those who got low scores come from programs in Home Economics and Physical Education.

It is also interesting to note that the performance of the BSE in their specialization is higher than the BEED, which maybe due to the fact that BSE has more units of specialization (68 units) courses than BEED (54 units) as reflected in the institution's teacher education programs. Both programs consist of 71-77 units in general education while the BEED has 3-units more than the BSE in their professional education courses.

Profile of the LET Passers and Non-passers

Table 1 shows the comparison between the LET passers and the non-passers in terms of their HS-GPA, admission test, General Education GPA, Professional Education GPA, Specialization GPA, College GPA, General Education Pre-board Score, Professional Education Pre-board score, Professional Education Pre-board score, and Total Pre-board score.

As shown in Table 1, the means obtained by the passers in all the variables were relatively higher than those obtained by the non-passers. Comparing the non-passers and the passers in terms of the variables, the biggest differences were found in the admission test scores and pre-board scores in general education, professional education and total scores. In the case of the admission test scores, the difference between the means of the two groups is 8.69, and the pre-board mean difference is 19.31. These results speak so much of the importance of the admission test and pre-board examinations to LET. TEIs have to develop stringent admission test and exit examination if they want their graduates to experience success in their licensure examination.

Table 1
Profile of LET Passers and Non-Passers by Research Variable

Variables	Passers (n=13)		Non-Passers (n=13)	
	Mean	**SD**	**Mean**	**SD**
HS-GPA	88.05	2.91	85.65	3.63
Admission Test	95.30	8.05	87.46	3.38
General Education GPA	86.55	1.71	84.68	1.74
Professional Education GPA	88.22	1.54	85.98	1.98
Specialization GPA	86.91	2.24	85.59	2.07
College GPA	87.07	1.46	85.40	1.29
General Education Pre-board Score	50.56	6.94	44.15	7.09
Professional Education Pre-board Score	50.19	12.74	42.23	9.67
Total Pre-board Score	100.81	16.88	86.38	13.04

The differences between the passers and the non-passers as indicated in the previous table may or may not be significant, that is why the researcher analyzed the data further and used the t-test for independent means. To match the number of passers and that of the non-passers, the researcher did a systematic random sampling using the list of passers. Out of the 273 passers, the researcher picked every 20th participant. Table 2 reveals the result of the t-test analysis.

Table 2
Summary of t-test Analysis for Significant Difference in Performance Between Passers (n=13) and Non-Passers (n=13) in Terms of Research Variables

Research Variables	t	Df	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)
Admission Test	3.175	24	8.69	.004
HS GPA	2.100	24	3.04	.046
General Education GPA	2.933	24	2.07	.007
Professional Education GPA	3.416	24	2.34	.002
Specialization GPA	0.973	24	0.89	.340
College GPA	2.720	24	1.58	.012
General Education Pre-board Score	3.723	24	9.31	.001
Professional Education Pre-board Score	2.223	24	10.38	.036
Total Pre-board Score	3.303	24	19.31	.003

As shown in Table 2, the passers and the non-passers significantly differed in all the variables except in specialization GPA. Looking at the table, one can infer that a possible gauge of one's success in LET could be partially attributed to their intellective capital in their teacher education program and the outcome of the pre-board examination, which was referred to as the exit exam before taking the LET in this study

Table 3 shows the corresponding coefficient of determination of the variables entered as predictors of LET scores of the BEED sample. The stepwise criterion is 0.05.

Table 3
Regression Analysis for Determining Predictors of LET Performance of the BEED Graduates

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE	F-value	P
1	.555[a]	.308	.300	2.608	40.034	.000[a]
2	.604[b]	.365	.350	2.513	25.532	.000[b]
3	.631[c]	.398	.377	2.460	19.379	.000[c]
4	.625[d]	.390	.377	2.462	28.485	.000[d]

a. Predictors: (Constant), CGPA
b. Predictors: (Constant), CGPA, AT
c. Predictors: (Constant), CGPA, AT, ProfEdGPA
d. Predictors: (Constant), AT, ProfEdGPA

When the admission variables, academic variables and pre-board performance were subjected to regression analysis with LET scores as dependent variable, three predictors came out: college GPA, admission test, and ProfEd GPA. College GPA entered the analysis first, which has the highest correlation coefficient with the dependent variable. 30.8% of the variance of the LET performance is attributed to the college GPA alone (F-value= 40.034, $p< 0.1$). This means that the success in LET can be attributed to the performance of the student in his/her 4-year teacher education program. The second variable to enter the regression analysis was the admission test, which when combined with the college GPA resulted in an R squared of 0.365, which means that about 6% is contributed by the admission test performance to one's success in LET. The combination of the admission test and college performance is 36.5% of the variance in the BEED sample's LET general averages (F-value=25.532; $p<0.01$). The professional education GPA entered as the third variable in the equation, a small but significant increase in the value of the multiple regression coefficients was seen, from 0.604 to 0.631. This indicates that the professional education GPA has a significant contribution to LET performance. The derived R^2 is 0.398 which points out that 39.8% of the variability in LET performance can be explained by the college GPA, admission test and professional education GPA (F-value =19.379, $p <0.01$). Table 4 shows the B coefficients of each variable entered into the model.

Table 4
Statistics Associated with the Variables Included in the Multiple Regression Analysis for BEED program

Model		Unstandardized B		Standardized B	t	P
		B	SE			
1	(Constant)	-45.24	19.65		-2.30	.024
	CGPA	1.42	.22	.55	6.32	.000
2	(Constant)	-38.60	19.08		-2.02	.046
	CGPA	1.23	.22	.48	5.42	.000
	AT	.10	.03	.25	2.81	.006
3	(Constant)	-44.90	18.89		-2.37	.020
	CGPA	.44	.42	.17	1.05	.297
	AT	.12	.03	.28	3.24	.002
	PEGPA	.83	.37	.35	2.20	.030
4	(Constant)	-37.27	17.45		-2.13	.035
	AT	.13	.03	.31	3.75	.000
	PEGPA	1.17	.20	.49	5.86	.000

a. course = BEED
b. Dependent Variable: LETGPA

In predicting the BEED sample's LET general average, Model 4 is better to adopt as it is more parsimonious than that of Model 3, although the latter explains more variance of the LET score. As shown in Table 4, when CGPA is combined with PEGPA (Model 3), CGPA becomes a non-significant predictor, and so it was deleted in Model 4. Thus, Model 4 (without CGPA) seems to be the more appropriate model. Looking at their beta weights, the admission test has a ***B*** coefficient of 0.136 while professional education GPA is 1.175 (See Table 4). It indicates that for each 1unit increase in the admission test, the LET general average might be expected to increase by 0.136 units, and for each unit increase in the professional education GPA, the LET general average is expected to rise by 1.175 units. In addition, the value of the dependent variable at which the regression line cuts the y-axis above a value of zero on the x-axis is -37.270. Hence the equation for the regression line is given below:

To illustrate the formula using the computed means of the sample for the identified predictors, if the mean score of a BEED graduate in admission test is 94 and has a GPA of 88 in the professional education, then the predicted average rating in the LET is 78.91. Looking at the data of one case in the sample with this admission test score and PEGPA, the result of LET of this case is really close to the mean LET rating of 79.01 of the BEED sample. If the effect of the cut-off score in the admission test is tested, that is at 70, and granting the professional education GPA is 88, then the outcome of that in the LET is most likely 75.65. However, if the professional education is lower than, say 85, most likely the score in the LET is a failing one. The result also indicates the need to increase the cut-off score of the institution's admission test if it wants

students who will have a greater likelihood to be successful in passing the LET. Likewise, the teaching of the professional education courses should be effective and meaningful as this component of the teacher education program weighs so much in teacher applicant's success in the LET. This result could explain why it is possible for non-education degree graduates to enter the teaching profession after having taken their Certificate in Teaching Program and have passed the LET. As results reveal, it is this component of the examination that seems to ensure readiness of TEIs graduates to enter the teaching profession.

Table 5 shows the predictors of the BSE graduates' LET general average. Four predictors came out: pre-board total score, college GPA, admission test, professional education GPA.

Table 5
Regression Analysis for Determining the Predictors of LET Performance of the BSE Graduates

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	SE	F-value	P
1	.587[a]	.344	.341	2.968	100.319	.000[a]
2	.650[b]	.422	.416	2.793	69.421	.000[b]
3	.682[c]	.465	.457	2.695	54.761	.000[c]
4	.691[D]	.477	.466	2.671	42.923	.000[D]
5	.686[E]	.470	.462	2.682	55.912	.000[E]

a. Predictors: (Constant), PBTotal
b. Predictors: (Constant), PBTotal, CGPA
c. Predictors: (Constant), PBTotal, CGPA, AT
d. Predictors: (Constant), PBTotal, CGPA, AT, ProfEdGPA
e. Predictors: (Constant), PBTotal, AT, ProfEdGPA

The first variable that entered as significant predictor is the pre-board total score, which explains 34.4% of the variance in the LET score. This is quite similar to the results revealed in the study of Montemayor, Roxas, and Panayon (2009), wherein 79.7% of the general average in LET of the BSE graduates was accounted for by the overall performance in the mock examination. The LET review committee should take the Pre-board examination seriously and they should create a valid and reliable tool that could contribute in determining the readiness of the graduates in taking the LET. Another significant predictor is college GPA, which when combined with the pre-board performance explains 42.2% of the BSE graduates' performance in the LET. Another significant predictor is the admission test, which when combined with the college GPA and pre-board score explain 46.5% of the performance in the LET of the BSE sample. Finally, the last significant predictor to LET is professional education

GPA, which when combined with pre-board total score, college GPA, and admission test reveal 47.7% of the variance in LET of the BSE sample.

In defining the best formula for success in the LET for BSE, model 5 in Table 6 is suggested. As shown in Table 6, the value of ***t*** indicates that the three variables are significantly different; hence, they are valid predictors of LET. It can be seen in the model that for each unit increase in the pre-board total score, there is a corresponding increase of 0.090 in the LET general average. For every one unit increase in the admission test score, there is a corresponding increase of 0.109 in the LET general average. Then for each unit increase in professional education GPA, there is a corresponding increase of 0.654 units in the LET general average. Consistent with the result of the BEED data, professional education program has the heaviest beta weight which implies its significant contribution in the development of professional teachers in the country. The results could explain the weight that is also given by PRC to professional education in the LET, which is 40% and 60% for BSE and BEED, respectively.

Table 6
Statistics Associated with the Variables Included in the Multiple Regression Analysis for the BSE Students' LET Performance

Model		Unstandardized B		Standardized B	t	P
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	62.295	1.724		36.134	.000
	PBTotal	.160	.016	.587	10.016	.000
2	(Constant)	1.075	12.207		.088	.930
	PBTotal	.111	.018	.406	6.187	.000
	CGPA	.766	.151	.332	5.060	.000
3	(Constant)	-2.005	11.804		-.170	.865
	PBTotal	.091	.018	.333	5.042	.000
	CGPA	.719	.147	.312	4.904	.000
	\AT	.098	.025	.224	3.889	.000
4	(Constant)	-7.173	11.954		-.600	.549
	PBTotal	.085	.018	.310	4.658	.000
	CGPA	.359	.224	.156	1.602	.111
	AT	.104	.025	.238	4.144	.000
	PEGPA	.414	.197	.200	2.104	.037
5	(Constant)	1.725	10.628		.162	.871
	PBTotal	.090	.018	.330	5.027	.000
	AT	.109	.025	.251	4.400	.000
	PEGPA	.654	.128	.316	5.111	.000

a. course = BSE
b. Dependent Variable: LETGPA

To illustrate the formula, if the examinee has a pre-board score of 107, admission test score of 96 and a Professional Education GPA of 88, then the predicted average rating in the LET is 79.37.

In summary, the regression outputs reveal the predictors that account for the LET performance of the sample. In BEED, the significant predictors identified are college GPA, admission test score, and professional education GPA and these variables account for 39% of the variance in the overall rating of an examinee of the LET. In BSE, three significant predictors came out such as the Pre-board total score, admission test, and professional education GPA and these variables account 47% of the variation in the results of the LET.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The results of the study reveal important information that could serve as guidance in crafting more effective institutional policies and standards in TEIs. The study could significantly contribute to the TEIs in the Philippines on how to increase the likelihood to succeed in the LET for BEED and BSE graduates by using the formulas proposed in this study. Factors that should be looked into include the admission requirements of the institution, the quality of the delivery of the professional education component of the teacher education program, and the effectiveness of the refresher program and the pre-board given prior to taking the licensure examination. In both teacher education programs, the admission test came out a significant predictor of success in passing the LET. This could justify the practice of setting stringent requirement to entrants to the teaching profession to accept only those who have met the minimum required foundational knowledge and the aptitude to teaching set at least at 75% of what has been tested similar to the requirement for certification to practice one's profession. The teaching of the professional education courses should be strengthened to expose students to various classroom situations, as they are usually the context reflected in written examinations. The conduct of the review classes should be effective as it is also found contributory to graduates' success in the LET. The administration of the pre-board should simulate how the actual LET is done to prepare the examinees on the conditions expected when they take it. The results also reveal possible lessons as to what the LET most likely to measure and the design of the pre-board examination as a quality assurance device to grant registration of license to teach to graduates of TEIs.

Likewise, the study also provides data to CHED when improving the design of the mandated curriculum to teacher education students particularly in the light of the K to 12 Reform. The components of the teacher education program such as general education, specialization, and professional education should be strengthened with emphasis on professional education. Such component could integrate the *whats and hows* in the teaching of the different subject areas in basic education, as they are the kinds of items most likely stressed in the licensure examination for teachers and what is viewed important as well in the real classroom. Emphasis given on the professional

education courses not only in the curriculum but also in the assessment of would-be teachers is viewed as the most practical way to develop and gauge the teacher applicants' ability to make decisions to facilitate their students' learning when faced with different situations in the classroom.

The study is also an input to PRC to gauge the validity and effectiveness of the system in certifying teachers. The significant difference in the entry and actual performance of the teacher applicants in their institution is consistent with the ones that have been successful and not in the licensure examination for teachers. However, other ways should be explored to capture the capabilities of the TEIs' graduates who satisfied both the entry and exit requirements of the program and have the potential to become effective teachers but may not have been in the best condition to take the high-stake examination given by PRC.

Finally, the study reveals that almost half only of the components of the teacher education program define success in the LET, which means that some other ways of assessment of teachers' readiness to teach should be explored. The present system of certifying teachers' readiness to teach through the use of pen-and-paper multiple choice test may need to be looked into as it may have limitations in assessing what has been acquired and developed by the graduates as a result of their 4-year teacher education program. The modality of certifying teachers through a test may deprive graduates of TEIs from programs that are skills-based like Home Economics and Physical Education, who could best show their potential to be a teacher in domain/areas not effectively captured by a test.

References

Commission on Higher Education (2004). *Revised Policies and Standards for Undergraduate Teacher Education Curriculum*. Retrieved from http://www.ched.gov.ph//wpcontent/uploads/2013/07/CMO-No.30-s2004.pdf

Hanushek, E. A. (2005). The Economics of School Quality. German Economic Review, 6(3), pp 269-286

Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2010). Generalizations about using value-added measures of teacher quality. *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings, 3*, 100.

Hermosisima, M.C. (2003). *PNU graduates' performance in the licensure examination for teachers (2000-2002): Approximating sources of variance*. Unpublished masteral thesis, Philippine Normal University, Manila.

Mancao, M.C. and Orleans, A.V. (2010). *Revisiting the Philippine Normal University Admission Test (PNUAT): Basis for Procedural Enhancement and Test Items Revision.* Research Series No. 127.

Montemayor, E. S., Roxas, C. C., & Panayon, V.L. (2009). Mock examination: Its influence on performance in the licensure examination for teachers. *University of the Cordilleras Research Journal 1*(3), 1-11.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education (2000). *Ensuring Teacher Quality: A Continuum of Teacher Preparation and Development. Policy Brief*. Retrieved from http://www.wested.org/resources/ensuring-teacher-quality-a-continuum-of-teacher-preparation-and-development/

Philippine Business for Education (2013). *Licensure Examination Performance of Teacher Education Institutions in the Philippines*. Retrieved from www.pbed.ph

Philippine Normal University (2009). LET Review Evaluation Report. Manila

Professional Regulation Commission (2014). *January 2014 Results of Licensure Examination for Teachers*. Retrieved from http://prc.gov.ph/news/?id=701 on August 20, 2014.

Professional Regulation Commission (1994). *Republic Act 7836 "Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994"*. Retrieved from http://www.prc.gov.ph/prb/default.aspx?id=38&content=223

Salandanan, G.S. (2001). Teacher Education Journal. Katha Publishing., Inc. Quezon CityThe WorldBank (2010). *Teacher policies around the world: objectives, rationale, methodological approach, and product*. Education Team Human Development. Retrieved from http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EDUCATION/Resource/Vegasetal_Teacher policiesaround the world.draft.pdf

Whitcomb, J.A. & Rose, T. (2008). Teacher Quality: What does research tell us? *The Alliance for Quality Teaching*. Colorado.