



PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF SUCCESS IN THE CRIMINOLOGY LICENSURE EXAMINATION: A STUDY OF SFC CABAGAN CAMPUS GRADUATES

Alan Jay R. Acierda
Jay-R B. Roque

*Saint Ferdinand College- City of Ilagan Campus, City of Ilagan,
Isabela, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study determined the predictive factors of success in the Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE) among graduates of Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus. Specifically, it examined the influence of demographic characteristics, study habits and review practices, test anxiety, self-efficacy, motivation, and institutional factors, including quality instruction, school facilities, and on-the-job training (OJT) experiences, on licensure examination success. A descriptive-quantitative research design was utilized. The respondents consisted of sixty-nine (69) criminology graduates from Academic Years 2021–2022 to 2024–2025 who passed the CLE from 2022 to 2025. Total enumeration was employed. Data were gathered through a researcher-made questionnaire administered via Google Forms and analyzed using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, chi-square test, and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The findings revealed that study habits and review practices, self-efficacy, motivation, quality instruction, and OJT experiences were perceived as significant contributors to licensure examination success. Test anxiety had minimal influence on examination performance and no significant effect on the likelihood of passing the CLE. Likewise, age, sex, General Weighted Average (GWA), socioeconomic status, and mock board examination results showed no significant relationship with examination outcomes. Among the factors examined, study habits, self-efficacy, motivation, and institutional support emerged as the strongest contributors to success. The study concluded that CLE success is primarily influenced by effective academic preparation, strong self-belief, sustained motivation, and supportive institutional practices. It is recommended that criminology programs strengthen review interventions, enhance instructional quality, provide experiential

learning opportunities, and promote students' confidence and motivation to improve licensure examination performance.

Keywords: *Criminology Licensure Examination, predictive factors, study habits, self-efficacy, motivation*

INTRODUCTION

Passing the Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE) is a very important step for criminology graduates in the Philippines who want to be professional and credible in the field of law enforcement agencies. It is a prerequisite for becoming a certified criminologist, it has important effect for both individual for their career advancement and likewise pride of school for molding registered criminologist.

Determining the predictive factors of success is essential. It is the goal of each institution offering a Bachelor of Science in Criminology to increase their school passing rate above the national passing level. This goal is aligned with the purpose of this study, while it appears that the criminology licensure examination is tremendously hard, there might be some solutions that can be taken into consideration if only the effect of it is established such as improving the examinee's review attitude and review habits. The board examination serves not only as a gateway to professional practice but also as a measure of the effectiveness of academic preparation in criminology programs. It is of the utmost importance for educators, administrators, and students to understand the factors that contribute to success in this licensure examination.

A student's academic career comes to an end when they pass this difficult test, which also opens a wide range of career options, including leadership positions and government service according to Albina et al. (2022). Higher education institutions offering criminology programs, such as Saint Ferdinand College—Cabagan Campus, consider licensing examination outcomes to be major indications of academic effectiveness and program excellence. Besides, those who failed the board exams frequently experience significant problems in preparing for exams.

The concept of Criminology Licensure examination is very wide, it consists of 6 areas to be taken on 3 consecutive days. According to the percentage results of Criminology Board Exams last August 2025, it has 13,074 or equivalent to 51.45% passers out of 25, 410 individuals who took the exam. Also, February 2025, it has 22, 245 or equivalent to 60.50% passers out of 36, 768 individuals who took the exam. Moreover, August 2024 is 11, 121 or equivalent to 49. 34% passers out of 22, 539 individuals. This has a positive connotation, especially to the college and universities that produce a higher number of individuals who comply with the standards. Despite an increasing number of graduates taking the Criminology Licensure Examination each year, national passing rates have remained inconsistent, thus raising concerns about a several factors influencing examinee success and lack of information regarding the experiences, and tactics of high-achieving criminology students. As the demand for competent and ethical

criminologists increases, so does the need to determine the factors that lead to successful licensure results. Over time, educators and administrators have investigated the underlying elements determining examinee performance. While numerous review programs and academic interventions have been created to assist graduates, still there remains a need to determine the most significant predictors of success in the licensure examination. Understanding and identifying these predictive indicators can help in developing more effective teaching tactics, student support networks, and review programs designed to improve licensure outcomes. Each school has lots of techniques and strategies that will make them successful in preparation for the CLE.

Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus is a dynamic Catholic educational institution committed to developing individuals of competence and character through holistic education and dedicated service toward the advancement of a just and humane society. However, the institution faced challenges related to its performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE), particularly in terms of its board examination performance and ranking. This situation prompted the researcher to investigate the predictive factors associated with success in the CLE among graduates who successfully passed the examination. The study was intended to provide insights into the factors that contributed to their success, which could serve as a basis for developing appropriate interventions, strategies, and support mechanisms for future criminology graduates.

The researcher was encouraged to conduct the study after recognizing the importance of identifying the various predictors of success in the Criminology Licensure Examination. Specifically, the study aimed to determine the predictors of success in the CLE among graduates of Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus. It focused on academic variables such as general weighted average, mock board examination ratings, and review session attendance, as well as non-academic factors such as study habits, motivation, time management, socioeconomic background, and institutional support. The study also sought to identify the factors that were most strongly associated with success in the CLE.

The findings provided criminology educators, review centers, and aspiring criminologists with valuable insights for developing more targeted interventions, strategies, and support systems to improve licensure outcomes. Through these findings, key variables influencing success in the CLE were identified, which could contribute to the improvement of criminology education and the development of more competent, prepared, and professional criminologists equipped to serve in various sectors of the criminal justice system.

Research Questions

1. How do the study habits and review practices relate to Criminology licensure examination?
2. What is the test anxiety level of the students before taking the board examination?
3. Does test anxiety significantly affect the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination?
4. How do self-efficacy and motivation predict the board exam results?

5. Do the following demographic variables significantly influence examination outcomes?
 - a. Age;
 - b. Sex;
 - c. GWA;
 - d. Socioeconomic status; and
 - e. Course Evaluation/ Mockboard Results?
6. How do the following institutional factors contribute to Criminology licensure examination success?
 - a. Quality Instruction;
 - b. Facilities; and
 - c. OJT experience?
7. Which combination of factors best predict the success in Criminology Licensure Examination?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive-quantitative research design to examine the factors associated with success in the Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE) among graduates of Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus. The descriptive approach was used to describe and analyze the characteristics and patterns of the variables under investigation, while the quantitative approach enabled the researcher to measure and examine the relationships between the identified factors and licensure examination success. This design was appropriate for the study because it allowed the researcher to systematically describe and assess the academic, non-academic, and institutional factors associated with graduates' performance in the CLE.

The study examined academic factors such as general weighted average, mock board examination ratings, and review session attendance, as well as non-academic factors such as study habits, motivation, time management, and socioeconomic background. Institutional factors, including quality of instruction, learning resources, and institutional support, were also considered. Through the descriptive-quantitative approach, the study identified and analyzed the factors that were most strongly associated with success in the Criminology Licensure Examination.

Locale of the Study

This study was conducted at Saint Ferdinand College—Cabagan Campus, located in Centro, Cabagan, Isabela. Saint Ferdinand College is a private Catholic educational institution established in 1950 by the Knights of Columbus Ilagan Council 3705, with its main campus situated in Ilagan City, Isabela. The Cabagan Campus was established as a separate physical location for the college in 1999, when it took over the former School

of St. Paul the Apostle at Cabagan, Isabela, effective School Year 1999–2000, as per Board Resolution No. 221, dated February 24, 1999.

The Cabagan Campus offers various academic programs, including the Bachelor of Science in Criminology, which has produced numerous graduates who have taken the Criminology Licensure Examination administered by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). The campus is situated in the municipality of Cabagan, a first-class municipality in the province of Isabela, Philippines, which is strategically accessible to students from various towns and cities in the Cagayan Valley region.

Selection and Description of the Respondents

The respondents of the study were Criminology graduates of Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus from Academic Years 2021–2022 to 2024–2025. The researcher used the total enumeration method to identify the respondents and determine the predictive factors of success in the Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE) among the identified graduates. The eligibility criteria for participation in the study included graduates who had taken the CLE during the specified period and were willing to participate in the study and provide the necessary information.

The following was the distribution of the respondents per year.

School Year	Passers
2021-2022	14
2022-2023	5
2023-2024	15
2024-2025	34
Total	69

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to the conduct of the study, the researcher followed the established institutional research protocols and administrative procedures of Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus. A formal letter of request seeking permission to conduct the study was submitted to the research adviser for review and endorsement. Upon obtaining the research adviser's approval, the researcher coordinated with the Campus Overseer of Saint Ferdinand College–Cabagan Campus to secure the necessary institutional approval and ensure compliance with institutional guidelines and ethical standards. Since the respondents were alumni of the campus, the researcher explained the purpose and procedures of the study to the Campus Overseer and obtained the names of Criminology Licensure Examination (CLE) passers who graduated during Academic Years 2021–2022 to 2024–2025. The necessary approvals were obtained before the data-gathering process commenced.

Following institutional approval, the researcher coordinated with the Criminology faculty to identify eligible respondents. With the approval of the Campus Overseer, the researcher also coordinated with the designated secretary to facilitate the identification and communication of eligible CLE passers. The secretary's assistance was limited to identifying qualified respondents and disseminating the approved Google Forms questionnaire through existing group chats of the identified passers. This procedure enabled the researcher to reach the respondents through appropriate academic and alumni networks while observing the established institutional protocols.

The survey questionnaire was administered through Google Forms. An informed consent form was provided to each respondent before participation. The consent form explained the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, the respondents' right to decline participation, and the measures taken to ensure the confidentiality of the information provided. Respondents were informed that the data gathered would be used solely for academic and research purposes.

Ethical standards were observed throughout the data collection process. Access to the collected data was restricted to the researcher. The responses were automatically recorded and organized through the Google Forms platform. For documentation, validation, and record-keeping purposes, printed copies of the consolidated survey results were prepared and securely maintained by the researcher.

After the completion of data collection, the responses were retrieved, organized, collated, and prepared for statistical analysis. The data were subsequently analyzed and interpreted in accordance with the objectives and research questions of the study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

To analyze the data gathered for this study, the researcher used the following statistical tools:

Frequency and Percentage. This was used to analyze the profile of the respondents in terms of demographic variables, including age, sex, General Weighted Average (GWA), and socioeconomic status. Frequency counts and percentage distributions were computed to determine the proportion of respondents belonging to each category, providing a clear description of the sample characteristics.

Weighted Mean. This was utilized to determine the extent of influence of study habits and review practices on Criminology licensure examination performance, as well as the level of self-efficacy and motivation that predict board exam results. Additionally, it was used to assess the perceived impact of institutional factors, such as quality instruction, school facilities, and on-the-job training (OJT) experience, on licensure examination success.

Analysis of Variance F – test. This was employed to determine whether there was a significant difference in the test anxiety levels of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables.

Chi Square Test. This was used to determine the significant relationship between the respondents' Board Examination Outcomes and their selected demographic profile, including age, sex, GWA, socioeconomic status, and course evaluation/mock board results.

Overall-Weighted Mean. This was used to analyze the summary of factors that best predict success in the Criminology Licensure Examination.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Profile of the Respondents

1.1 Age

Table 1.1
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents
According to Age

Age	Frequency	Percent
23	6	8.7
24	13	18.8
25	23	33.3
26	18	26.1
27	6	8.7
28	1	1.4
29	2	2.9
Total	69	100

Table 1.1 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to age. Most of the respondents are 25 years old, with a frequency of 23 or 33.3 % of the total population. A minimal number of 1 or 1.4 % is in 28 years old. The age distribution indicates that the majority of those who took and passed the Criminology Licensure Examination are aged 25 to 26 whereas new graduates are only aged 21, suggesting that examinees tend to take and successfully pass the board examination a few years after graduation rather than immediately at age 21. This suggest that examinees tend to take the board exam soon after completing their academic requirements, which may enhance knowledge retention and improve their level of preparedness for the examination.

According to Barreda (2022), age, gender, civil status, and general point average are related significantly to the performance of the examinees in the licensure examination for criminologists, and the profile was also correlated significantly to their general point

average. The age of the examinees contributed to the process of preparing for the licensure examination for criminologists.

1.2 Sex

Table 1.2
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents
According to Sex

Sex:	Frequency	Percent
Female	13	18.8
Male	56	81.2
Total	69	100.0

As presented in the table, majority of the respondents are male with a frequency of 56 or 81.2 % of the total number of respondents. The female had a frequency of 13 or 18.8 %. The results indicate that the majority of the respondents are male, suggesting that the field of criminology remains male-dominated. This may reflect existing trends in enrollment and participation in criminology programs, which could influence the overall performance outcomes in the Criminology Licensure Examination.

According to Asuncion et.al. (2020), they found that the Gender Parity Index (GPI) for enrollment and graduates from school years 2012 up to 2019 favor males. This is an indication that criminology has been a male-dominated course since 2012. Since then, more males have enrolled and graduated in the program. With these findings, there is a need to increase access to females by providing inclusive opportunities by increasing the number of female aspirants to be accepted into the criminology program. Gender Parity Index (GPI) for shifters transferred to the criminology program during the school year 2012-2013 favor females, while there were equal Gender Parity Index (GPI) for both males and females during the school year 2018-2019 and GPI were favorable to males during the school year 2015-2016. It is a manifestation that more females were interested in shifting to the criminology program. The GPI for shifters from other programs were favorable to males. It shows that males were more interested to transfer from other programs after enrolling in the criminology program. The GPI for board passers and non-board passers were favorable to males from 2012 up to 2019. The data shows that the number of male board passers and non-passers is higher because the number of male board takers is higher compared to females.

1.3. General Weighted Average

Table 1.3
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents
According to General Weighted Average

Range	General Weighted Average (GWA)	Frequency	Percent
91-93	1.50	1	1.4
88-90	1.75	4	5.8
85-87	2.00	29	42.0
80-84	2.50	30	43.5
75-79	3.00	5	7.2
	Total	69	100.0

As presented in the table, majority of the respondents had a general weighted average of 2.50 with a frequency of 30 or 43.5% of the total number of respondents, also the respondents had a general weighted average of 2.00 with a frequency of 29 or 42.0%, while there is only 1 who had a general weighted average of 1.50 or 1.4 of the total number of respondents. The results indicate that the majority of the respondents have a General Weighted Average (GWA) clustered around 2.50, suggesting that most graduates demonstrate an average level of academic performance.

The results of the licensure examination reflect the students' readiness to take the test, the quality of teaching provided by the faculty, and the students' exposure to practical learning opportunities through the resources and equipment supplied by the administration. The general weighted average (GWA) of graduates across various subject areas has been found to correlate with their performance in board examinations, reflecting the academic preparation that contributes to their success or failure. As noted by Dayaday (2018), the results of the licensure examination reflect not only students' academic performance but also the quality of teaching provided by the faculty, students' exposure to practical learning opportunities, and the resources and equipment supplied by the administration. This finding implies that students with average academic performance can still succeed in the CLE if they are adequately prepared through effective instruction, review programs, and institutional support.

Also, Guiyab and Tarun (2023) attempted to predict the result of the licensure examination using the JRip rule-based algorithm and the J48 decision tree algorithm. Through their study, they revealed that the student's general weighted average (G.W.A.) is a significant predictor of better board performance. The G.W.A. of the student serves as evidence of his effort during his undergraduate years, and having a meritorious G.W.A. may indicate that the student practices a positive study habit. This may prove the relationship between the student's review habits and board performance that this study is aiming to unravel.

1.4. Socio-economic Status

Table 1.4
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents
According to their Socio-economic Status

Socioeconomic Status	Frequency	Percent
Below ₱10,957 monthly income	11	15.94
₱10,957- ₱21, 914	53	76.81
₱21, 914 - ₱43,828	5	7.25
Total	69	100.00

Table 1.4 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their Socio-economic Status. As gleaned in the table, majority of the respondents, comprising 53 or 76.81%, belong to the low-income but not poor category earning ₱10,957–₱21,914. This indicates that most of the participants have limited financial resources but are still above the poverty threshold. Meanwhile, 11 respondents or 15.94% are classified as poor, earning below ₱10,957 monthly income. This suggests that a notable portion of the respondents' experiences financial hardship. On the other hand, only 5 respondents or 7.25% fall under the lower middle-income group (₱21,914–₱43,828), indicating that very few participants have relatively better economic conditions. This indicates that the respondents are predominantly from lower-income groups, which may influence their access to resources, opportunities, and overall living conditions.

This classification of income levels is based on the standards set by the Philippine Statistics Authority (2024–2025), which define income brackets and poverty thresholds in the Philippines. Overall, the data indicate that the respondents are predominantly from lower-income groups, which may influence their access to resources, opportunities, and overall living conditions.

In the study of Mensah et al. (2020) revealed that the students' problems in preparing for the Licensure Examination for Teachers were as follows: insufficient review materials, insufficient time to focus on the review, financial problems, difficulty understanding the content, inability to enroll in examine classes, insufficient psychological and emotional preparedness, insignificant review materials, attitude problem, inconsistent responses in the review materials, and some graduate students.

1.5 Mock board Results

Table 1.5
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents
According to Mock Board Results

Mock board Results/ Course Evaluation Results	Frequency	Percent
75.00	4	5.8
78.00	2	2.9
79.00	4	5.8
80.00	16	23.2
81.00	10	14.5
82.00	6	8.7
83.00	8	11.6
84.00	3	4.3
85.00	9	13.0
86.00	3	4.3
87.00	2	2.9
88.00	2	2.9
Total	69	100.0

Table 1.5 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents according to their mock board examination results. As presented in the table, majority of the respondents had a mock board rating of 80.00 with a frequency 16 or 23.2% of the total number of respondents, also the respondents got a mock board rating of 81 with a frequency of 10 or 14.5%, while the respondents got a mock board rating of 78, 87 and 88 with a frequency of 2 or 2.9% of the respondents. This indicates that most respondents obtained mock board ratings around 80, indicating a generally satisfactory level of preparedness for the Criminology Licensure Examination. This implies that the majority of graduates possess a moderate level of competence and are nearing the expected standard needed to pass the actual board exam. Furthermore, the mock boards might not be effective or needs to be reviewed as these do not significantly affect the board exam results.

Lascano and Bansiong (2017) recognized that attendance at review classes can increase one's chances of passing exams. Furthermore, Herrero (2015) highlighted the importance of university and review school-administered pre-board or mock board exams. She also noticed that review centers have current review resources. Regular attendance

at review sessions offered by review centers is also a contributory factor that increases the chances of passing the CLE.

1.6 Board Exam Rating

Table 1.6
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents
According to Board Exam Rating

Board Exam Rating:	Frequency	Percent
75.00	11	15.9
76.00	4	5.8
77.00	5	7.2
78.00	4	5.8
79.00	8	11.6
80.00	8	11.6
81.00	6	8.7
82.00	1	1.4
83.00	10	14.5
84.00	3	4.3
85.00	4	5.8
86.00	4	5.8
89.00	1	1.4
Total	69	100.0

As shown in the Table 1.6, majority of the respondents had a board exam rating of 75.00 with a frequency 11 or 15.9% of the total number of respondents, also the respondents got a board exam rating of 83 with a frequency of 10 or 14.5%, while there is only 1 who got a board exam rating of 89.00. The results indicate that most respondents obtained a board exam rating of 75.00, which is typically the passing mark, suggesting that a large proportion of graduates are able to meet the minimum requirement for licensure. This implies that while many examinees are able to pass, their performance tends to cluster at the borderline level, reflecting the need for further academic and review enhancement.

According to Barreda (2022), she correlated the academic performance of criminology graduates with their performance on their licensure examination. Based on her findings, she discussed that those who were able to pass their licensure examination had good academic performance during their academic years in contrast to those who failed. This study further proves the significance of academic performance to the chances of the graduates passing their licensure examination, and as established by other studies cited, academic performance is correlated with good study habits, which means that positive review habits will positively impact the chances of one person passing the criminologist licensure examination. Board examinations assess what students have

learned over their four years in college. It is important to note that some graduates may need to pause their education for a semester or even several years. Consequently, reviewing the material is essential to better prepare them for the licensure exam. There is no guarantee that knowledge acquired in the first year of college will remain fresh in their minds by the time they take the board exam. Performance in the licensure examination is an outcome of the quality education in educational institutions. The programs and policies implemented to generate high percentage of the licensure examination performance, measure the results obtained of the school performance in the licensure exam according to Garcia (2020).

2. Study habits and review practices predict licensure results.

2. 1 Study Habits

Table 2.1

Mean Distribution and Description on the Influence of Study Habits and Review Practices in Performance in the Criminology Board Exams in terms of Study Habits.

A. Study Habits	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I followed regular study schedule	3.74	Very Much
2. I studied at least 2-24 hours a day.	3.49	Very Much
3. I reviewed even when I felt tired and motivated.	3.25	Very Much
4.I studied in a quiet and distraction-free environment	3.67	Very Much
5. I set specific goals for every study session.	3.68	Very Much
6. I took short break to avoid mental fatigue.	3.67	Very Much
7. I focused more on difficult subjects.	3.55	Very Much
8. I avoided cramming before the exams.	3.48	Very Much
Category Mean	3.57	Very Much

Table 2.3 reveals the mean distribution and description on the influence of study habits and review practices in performance in the criminology board exams as perceived by the respondents in terms of study habits. The overall mean of 3.57 interpreted as Very Much indicated that study habits and review practices greatly influence performance in the criminology board exam.

However, the highest rated indicator is statement “I followed regular study schedule” with a weighted mean of 3.74 or “Very Much”. Also, the least indicator but described as Very Much is statement “I reviewed even when I felt tired and motivated”. With a weighted mean of 3.25. and described as Very Much. This implies that consistent and goal-oriented study habits are essential for success in the criminology board exam.

While students generally demonstrate strong discipline, the slightly lower rating on studying despite fatigue suggests a need to enhance resilience and sustained motivation, especially during challenging situations.

According to Caulfield (2023), establishing a consistent daily study routine fosters a structured learning environment that promotes discipline and effective study habits. By designating specific periods for various subjects, students are able to manage their time efficiently and ensure a comprehensive review of all essential learning materials. Such structured routines help minimize procrastination, enhance focus, and improve information retention, ultimately contributing to better academic outcomes and preparedness for licensure examinations. Another critical aspect of effective study routines is the balance between intensity and relaxation. Intensive study periods, such as studying for up to 15 hours a day in the final months before an exam, require careful planning to avoid mental fatigue as mentioned by Caldwell et al. (2019).

Ultimately, disciplined time management and well-structured study routines are essential components in mastering the extensive scope of content covered in licensure examinations. These practices enable students to allocate adequate time for review, maintain focus, and systematically cover all necessary topics.

2.2 Review Practices

Table 2.2

Mean Distribution and Description on the Influence of Study Habits and Review Practices in Performance in the Criminology Board Exams in terms of Review Practices

B. Review Practices	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I attended review classes regularly.	3.58	Very Much
2. I used review books and updated materials.	3.64	Very Much
3. I answered practice tests and mock exams.	3.65	Very Much
4. I reviewed past board exam questions.	3.59	Very Much
5. I took notes during review session.	3.65	Very Much
6. I analyze my mistakes in practice exams.	3.51	Very Much
7. I joined group reviews or discussions.	3.49	Very Much
8. I focused on core criminology subjects.	3.57	Very Much
CATEGORY MEAN	3.59	Very Much

Table 2.2 reveals the mean distribution and description on the influence of study habits and review practices in performance in the criminology board exams as perceived

by the respondents in terms of review practices. The overall mean of 3.59 interpreted as Very Much indicated that regularly reviewing lessons, practicing exam questions, and engaging in structured review activities are key factors that help graduates perform better in the licensure examination.

As gleaned in the table, on the indicators described as Very Much, the highest rated indicators are statements “I answered practice tests and mock exams.” and “I took notes during review session.” with a weighted mean of 3.65 or “Very Much”. Also, the least indicator but described as Very Much is statement “I joined group reviews or discussions.” with a weighted mean of 3.49.

This implies that active and structured review practices, such as taking notes and completing practice tests, are crucial for success in the criminology board exam. While group discussions are slightly less utilized, promoting collaborative review strategies could further enhance learning and exam readiness, emphasizing the need for both individual and group review approaches in preparation for the board examination.

Review center materials are noted for their alignment with the curriculum and exam expectations, offering targeted content that enhances study efficiency according to Kandiko & Kingsbury (2023). Moreover, the emphasis on review center materials reflects a broader trend in board exam preparation, where candidates prioritize structured resources that offer a clear roadmap to success. These materials, according to Knoch et al. (2020), often include practice questions and mock exams that simulate the actual testing environment, helping candidates to familiarize themselves with exam formats and time constraints. Moreover, success in their academic pursuits is attributed to the effective implementation of various learning strategies and techniques. Individuals enhance their comprehension and retention of key concepts by incorporating methods such as mnemonics, note-taking, and active engagement with course materials according to Hanawi et al. (2022).

3. Test Anxiety level of the Students Before Taking the Board Examinations

Table 3.1

Mean Distribution and Description of Test Anxiety level of the Students Before Taking the Board Examinations in terms of Cognitive Anxiety

A. Cognitive anxiety	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I worried excessively about failing the board exams.	2.38	Not Much
2. I doubted my ability despite studying well.	1.77	Not Much
3. I had difficulty concentrating during the exam.	1.49	Not at all

4. Negative thoughts affected my performance.	1.54	Not at all
5. I kept thinking about the exam result while answering.	1.68	Not at all
MEAN	1.77	Not Much

Table 3.1 presents the mean distribution and description of the respondents' test anxiety level in terms of cognitive anxiety. The overall mean of 1.77, interpreted as "Not Much," indicates that the respondents experienced a low level of cognitive anxiety before and during the board examination. This suggests that the respondents were generally able to manage anxious thoughts and maintain focus, which may have contributed positively to their exam performance.

Among the indicators, the highest level of cognitive anxiety was observed in "I worried excessively about failing the board exams" with a mean of 2.38, interpreted as "Not Much," indicating that while some worry was present, it was not overwhelming. The lowest-rated indicators were "I had difficulty concentrating during the exam" with a mean of 1.49 and "Negative thoughts affected my performance" with a mean of 1.54, both interpreted as "Not at All," suggesting that the respondents were able to maintain concentration and did not experience significant interference from negative thoughts. Additionally, "I kept thinking about the exam result while answering" obtained a mean of 1.68, also interpreted as "Not at All," indicating that the respondents were generally able to focus on the task at hand rather than being preoccupied with outcomes.

This implies that although respondents experienced some level of worry about failing and occasional self-doubt, these cognitive aspects of test anxiety were generally low and did not significantly affect their exam performance. Notably, difficulty in concentration was not a concern at all, suggesting that respondents were still able to stay focused during the examination. Overall, this indicates that cognitive anxiety is not a major barrier to passing the Criminology Licensure Examination, and other factors may have a greater influence on success.

According to Putwain et al. (2016), cognitive anxiety negatively affects examination outcomes due to intrusive thoughts such as fear of failure and self-criticism, which distract examinees from focusing on test tasks. These cognitive distractions are especially critical in licensure examinations where pressure and consequences are high.

Table 3.2

Mean Distribution and Description of Test Anxiety level of the Students Before Taking the Board Examinations in terms of Emotional Anxiety

B. Emotional Anxiety	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I felt extremely nervous before the exam	2.00	Not Much
2. I panic during the exams	1.36	Not at all
3. I was tensed even after the exam	1.46	Not at all
4. Fear of failure affected my confidence.	1.58	Not at all
5. I felt calm and relaxed during the exams.	1.94	Not Much
MEAN	1.67	Not at all

Table 3.2 presents the mean distribution and description of the respondents' test anxiety level in terms of emotional anxiety. The overall mean of 1.67, interpreted as "Not at All," indicates that the respondents experienced a very low level of emotional anxiety before and during the board examination. This suggests that the respondents were generally able to manage their emotions and did not experience significant nervousness, panic, or tension that could negatively affect their exam performance.

Among the indicators, the highest level of emotional anxiety was observed in "I felt extremely nervous before the exam" with a mean of 2.00, interpreted as "Not Much," indicating that while some respondents experienced nervousness before the exam, it was not overwhelming. This was followed by "I felt calm and relaxed during the exams" with a mean of 1.94, also interpreted as "Not Much," suggesting that the respondents generally maintained a sense of calmness during the examination.

The lowest-rated indicators were "I panicked during the exams" with a mean of 1.36, "I was tensed even after the exam" with a mean of 1.46, and "Fear of failure affected my confidence" with a mean of 1.58, all interpreted as "Not at All." These findings indicate that the respondents did not experience significant panic, tension, or loss of confidence during or after the examination. The low levels of emotional anxiety suggest that the respondents were emotionally composed and confident in their abilities, which may have contributed positively to their exam performance.

This finding aligns with the study of Bumanglag et al. (2018), which found that emotionality (e.g., nervousness and physiological arousal) did not significantly predict examination performance, unlike cognitive anxiety, which had a stronger negative effect. The low level of emotional anxiety observed in this study suggests that the respondents were able to manage their emotions effectively, which may have contributed to their success in the Criminology Licensure Examination.

Table 3.3

**Mean Distribution and Description of Test Anxiety level of the Students
 Before Taking the Board Examinations in terms
 of Psychological Anxiety**

C. Psychological Anxiety	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. My heart was beating fast during the exams.	1.62	Not at all
2. I experience sweating and trembling during the exams.	1.45	Not at all
3. I had stomach discomfort during the exams.	1.33	Not at all
4. I experienced headache or dizziness during the exams.	1.26	Not at all
5. Physical tension interfered with my performance.	1.35	Not at all
MEAN	1.40	Not at all

Table 3.3 presents the mean distribution and description of the respondents' test anxiety level in terms of psychological anxiety. The overall mean of 1.40, interpreted as "Not at All," indicates that the respondents experienced a very low level of psychological anxiety before and during the board examination. This suggests that the respondents did not experience significant physical symptoms of anxiety, such as fast heartbeat, sweating, trembling, stomach discomfort, headache, or dizziness, which may have contributed positively to their ability to perform well and manage examination pressure effectively.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 1.62, interpreted as "Not at All," was observed in "My heart was beating fast during the exams," suggesting that some respondents experienced a slightly elevated heart rate, though it was not a significant concern. Conversely, the lowest mean of 1.26, also interpreted as "Not at All," was observed in "I experienced headache or dizziness during the exams," indicating that headaches and dizziness were the least experienced psychological symptoms.

The very low levels of psychological anxiety observed in this study suggest that the respondents were mentally and physically composed during the examination. This finding aligns with the study of Theobald et al. (2022), which demonstrated that test anxiety does not significantly predict exam performance when prior knowledge and preparation are controlled. Overall, the findings indicate that the respondents experienced a very low level of psychological anxiety, which likely contributed to their ability to perform well in the licensure examination.

Table 3.4

**Mean Distribution and Description of the Respondents' Test Anxiety Level in
 Terms of Perceived Impact on Exam Performance**

D. Perceived Impact on Exam Performance	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Test anxiety affected my ability to recall information.	1.57	Not at all
2. Anxiety caused me to make careless mistakes.	1.39	Not at all
3. Test anxiety lowered my exam rating.	1.48	Not at all
4. Managing anxiety improved my performance.	3.29	Very Much
MEAN	1.93	Not Much

Table 3.4 presents the mean distribution and description of the respondents' test anxiety level in terms of perceived impact on exam performance. The overall mean of 1.93, interpreted as "Not Much," indicates that the respondents experienced a low level of perceived impact of anxiety on their exam performance. This suggests that the respondents were generally confident and able to manage pressure, contributing to a more stable and effective exam performance.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 3.29, interpreted as "Very Much," was observed in "Managing anxiety improved my performance," indicating that the respondents strongly recognized the value of anxiety management strategies in enhancing their exam performance. Conversely, the lowest mean of 1.39, interpreted as "Not at All," was observed in "Anxiety caused me to make careless mistakes," followed by "Test anxiety lowered my exam rating" with a mean of 1.48 and "Test anxiety affected my ability to recall information" with a mean of 1.57, both also interpreted as "Not at All." These low ratings indicate that the respondents did not perceive anxiety as significantly hindering their recall, causing careless mistakes, or lowering their exam scores.

The findings suggest that while the respondents generally did not experience significant negative effects from anxiety, they strongly acknowledged that managing anxiety contributed to improved performance. This implies that effective anxiety management strategies, such as relaxation techniques, positive self-talk, and adequate preparation, may have played a crucial role in enhancing the respondents' exam outcomes. According to Putwain et al. (2016), students who interpret anxiety as manageable experience significantly reduced negative effects on performance, highlighting the role of cognitive appraisal in exam success. The findings also support the principles of Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory, which emphasizes the role of self-efficacy and coping strategies in managing anxiety and enhancing performance.

Overall, the findings indicate that the respondents experienced a low level of perceived negative impact from anxiety, while strongly recognizing the benefits of managing anxiety for improved exam performance.

Table 3.5

**Summary of the Respondents' Test Anxiety Level Before Taking
the Board Examination**

SUMMARY	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
A. Cognitive Anxiety	1.77	Not Much
B. Emotional Anxiety	1.67	Not at all
C. Psychological Anxiety	1.40	Not at all
D. Perceived Impact on Exam Performance	1.93	Not Much
MEAN	1.69	Not at all

Table 3.5 presents the summary of the respondents' test anxiety level before taking the board examination. The overall mean of 1.69, interpreted as "Not at All," indicates that the respondents experienced a very low level of test anxiety across all dimensions. This suggests that the respondents were generally composed and did not experience significant anxiety that could interfere with their exam performance, reflecting their mental, emotional, and psychological preparedness for the licensure examination.

As shown in the table, the highest mean of 1.93, interpreted as "Not Much," was observed in Perceived Impact on Exam Performance, indicating that the respondents perceived a slightly higher, though still low, impact of anxiety on their performance. This was followed by Cognitive Anxiety with a mean of 1.77, also interpreted as "Not Much," suggesting that while some respondents experienced occasional worry or self-doubt, these thoughts were not overwhelming. Emotional Anxiety obtained a mean of 1.67, interpreted as "Not at All," indicating that the respondents did not experience significant nervousness, panic, or tension. The lowest mean of 1.40, interpreted as "Not at All," was observed in Psychological Anxiety, indicating that the respondents experienced the least physical symptoms of anxiety, such as fast heartbeat, sweating, or dizziness, during the examination.

The very low levels of test anxiety across all dimensions indicate that the respondents were generally able to manage examination-related stress effectively. The slightly higher mean observed in Perceived Impact on Exam Performance suggests that the respondents were aware of their anxiety levels, but this awareness did not translate into significant interference with their performance. The low levels of cognitive, emotional, and psychological anxiety further indicate that the respondents maintained focus, composure, and physical well-being throughout the examination.

These findings align with the study of Cassady and Finch (2014), who emphasized that the impact of test anxiety on academic performance varies depending on the intensity of anxiety and the individual's coping skills. The respondents' ability to maintain a very low level of anxiety across all dimensions suggests that they possessed effective coping strategies, which may have contributed to their success in the Criminology Licensure Examination.

4. Does test anxiety significantly affects the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination?

Table 4
Results on the Significance of the Respondents' Test Anxiety Affecting the Likelihood of Passing the Criminology Licensure Examination

In terms of	Significance F	Decision	Remarks
A. Cognitive anxiety	.326	Accept Ho	Not Significant
B. Emotional Anxiety	.461	Accept Ho	Not Significant
C. Psychological Anxiety	.197	Accept Ho	Not Significant
D. Perceived Impact on Exam Performance	.279	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Table 4 presents the results of the statistical analysis used to determine whether the respondents' test anxiety significantly affects the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination. The significance values for Cognitive Anxiety at .326, Emotional Anxiety at .461, Psychological Anxiety at .197, and Perceived Impact on Exam Performance at .279 were all greater than the .05 level of significance. This led to the acceptance of the null hypothesis, indicating that test anxiety does not significantly affect the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination.

The findings suggest that test anxiety is not a significant predictor of licensure examination success. This implies that other factors—such as study habits, self-efficacy, motivation, and institutional support—may play a more significant role in determining examination outcomes. These results are consistent with the findings of Theobald et al. (2022) who demonstrated that test anxiety does not significantly predict exam performance when prior knowledge and preparation are controlled. Similarly, Cassady and Finch (2014) emphasized that the impact of anxiety on performance depends on the

intensity of anxiety and the individual's coping skills, suggesting that well-prepared students with effective coping strategies are less likely to be adversely affected by anxiety. The present findings support this view, as the respondents exhibited low levels of test anxiety across all dimensions, which were effectively managed and did not significantly hinder their performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination.

Overall, the findings indicate that test anxiety is not a significant factor affecting the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination. This underscores the importance of focusing on academic preparation, study habits, and psychological readiness rather than solely on reducing anxiety levels.

5. How do the self-efficacy and motivation predict the board exam results?

5.1 Self-Efficacy

Table 5.1
Mean Distribution and Description of Self-Efficacy in
Predicting Board Exam Results

A. Self-Efficacy	Mean	Description
1. I believed I could pass the board exams.	3.55	Very Much
2. I felt confident answering most of the exam questions.	3.12	Much
3. I trusted my preparation for the exams.	3.41	Very Much
4. I remained confident even when questions were difficult.	2.91	Much
5. I believed my efforts would lead to success.	3.43	Very Much
6. I could manage challenge during examination.	3.33	Very Much
CATEGORY MEAN	3.29	Very Much

Table 5.1 presents the mean distribution and description of self-efficacy as a predictor of board exam results as perceived by the respondents. The overall mean of 3.29, interpreted as "Very Much," indicates that the respondents strongly agreed that self-efficacy plays a significant role in predicting their success in the Criminology Licensure Examination. This suggests that graduates with higher self-efficacy—characterized by strong confidence in their abilities, trust in their preparation, and belief that their efforts will lead to success—are more likely to perform well in the board examination.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 3.55, interpreted as "Very Much," was observed in the statement "I believed I could pass the board exams," indicating that the respondents' overall belief in their capability to succeed was the strongest predictor of their exam performance. This was followed by "I believed my efforts would lead to success" with a mean of 3.43, and "I trusted my preparation for the exams" with a mean of 3.41, both interpreted as "Very Much." These findings suggest that confidence in one's

abilities and trust in one's preparation are key components of self-efficacy that predict board exam success.

Conversely, the lowest mean of 2.91, interpreted as "Much," was observed in the statement "I remained confident even when questions were difficult," indicating that while the respondents generally maintained confidence, their self-assurance slightly decreased when faced with challenging questions. This suggests that the ability to maintain situational confidence during difficult items is a predictor that may require further development to enhance overall exam performance.

These findings align with the study of Briones and Aguayo (2021), who emphasized that self-motivation, study skills, study habits, and time management are crucial factors that contribute to students' preparedness for licensure examinations. Their work highlights that students who demonstrate high motivation are more likely to perform well in such assessments. However, they also pointed out the importance of developing commitment and goal-setting skills, which play a vital role in achieving examination success. Additionally, they underscored the significance of health habits, suggesting that physical well-being should not be overlooked, as it can influence cognitive performance and focus during review and examination periods. This perspective supports the notion that aside from study habits and attitudes, maintaining good health practices is equally essential in enhancing the board performance of examinees.

5.2 Motivation

Table 5.2
Mean Distribution and Description of Motivation in
Predicting Board Exam Results

B. Motivation	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I was personally determined to pass the exams.	3.57	Very Much
2. I found studying for the board exam meaningful.	3.46	Very Much
3. I studied because I wanted to become a professional criminologist.	3.77	Very Much
4. I felt satisfaction when completing my review tasks.	3.62	Very Much
5. I was motivated by the desire for a stable job.	3.78	Very Much
6. I wanted to meet my family's expectation.	3.77	Very Much
7. Passing the board exam would improve my social status.	3.59	Very Much
Category Mean	3.65	Very Much

Table 5.2 presents the mean distribution and description of motivation as a predictor of board exam results as perceived by the respondents. The overall mean of 3.65, interpreted as "Very Much," indicates that the respondents strongly agreed that motivation plays a significant role in predicting their success in the Criminology Licensure Examination. This suggests that graduates with strong motivation are more likely to engage in consistent study habits, persist through challenges, and maintain focus during preparation.

Among the indicators, the highest mean of 3.78, interpreted as "Very Much," was observed in the statement "I was motivated by the desire for a stable job," indicating that extrinsic motivation, particularly the pursuit of career security, was the strongest motivating factor for the respondents. This was closely followed by "I studied because I wanted to become a professional criminologist" and "I wanted to meet my family's expectation," both with a mean of 3.77, also interpreted as "Very Much." These findings suggest that both career-oriented goals and family expectations are powerful drivers of motivation that enhance the respondents' dedication and persistence in preparing for the board exam.

Conversely, the lowest mean of 3.46, though still interpreted as "Very Much," was observed in the statement "I found studying for the board exam meaningful," indicating that while the respondents recognized the value of their preparation, intrinsic motivation—such as finding personal meaning in studying—was slightly less influential compared to extrinsic factors like job security and family expectations.

This study is aligned to the study of Schulz (2021), motivation plays a vital role in achieving academic success, encompassing both intrinsic and extrinsic factors that drive individuals to exert the effort and persistence required to accomplish their goals. It provides the underlying force that sustains engagement and commitment in one's tasks, roles, and academic pursuits. Motivation not only determine why individuals choose to engage in particular activities but also influences the amount of effort they invest and the duration of their perseverance. Essentially, it initiates, sustains, and directs behavior toward goal attainment. Alongside motivation, self-discipline is equally essential, as it enables individuals to remain focused, manage their time effectively, and maintain consistent study habits—all of which are critical in preparing for and successfully passing licensure or board examinations. according to Schulz.

5.3 General Impact of Self-Efficacy and Motivation on Board Performance

Table 5.3
Mean Distribution and Description on the General Impact of Self-Efficacy and Motivation on Board Performance

C. General Impact of Self-Efficacy and Motivation o Board Performance	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. My self-confidence generally affected my exam performance.	3.65	Very Much
2. My motivation helped me persist during long review periods.	3.72	Very Much
3. High motivation helped me overcome exam difficulties	3.74	Very Much
4. Self-efficacy played a major role in my exam result.	3.72	Very Much
CATEGORY MEAN	3.71	Very Much

Table 5.3 reveals the mean distribution and description on the general impact of self-efficacy and motivation on board performance. Generally, the respondents very much agreed on the statements in terms of the impact of self-efficacy and motivation on board performance with a weighted mean of 3.71. This implies that strong self-efficacy and motivation significantly enhance board exam performance, highlighting the need to foster confidence and drive during exam preparation.

Among the statements, the highest indicator was statement “High motivation helped me overcome exam difficulties” very much agreed that they overcome difficulties during the examination with a weighted mean of 3.74. Meanwhile, the least statement was statement “My self-confidence generally affected my exam performance” with a weighted mean of 3.65.

This implies that both high motivation and self-efficacy are crucial for exam success. Motivation helps graduates persist through long preparation periods and overcome difficult questions, while self-efficacy boosts confidence in their abilities. Strengthening these factors can improve performance and increase the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination.

According to Brown (2019), students who exhibit high levels of intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy are more likely to engage in effective study habits and overcome challenges associated with exam preparation. In general, motivated students are more resilient and persistent—qualities that are essential for navigating the demanding study schedule required for the Criminology Licensure Examination. Better performance is also influenced by psychological preparedness and stress-reduction techniques, highlighting the necessity of encouraging mental health services for prospective criminologists.

6. Do the following demographic variables significantly influence examination outcomes?

Table 6
Results on the Significant Relationship between the Respondents' Board Examination Outcomes and Their Selected Profile

Profile	Significance χ^2	Decision	Remarks
Age	.335	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Sex	.087	Accept Ho	Not Significant
GWA	.108	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Socio-economic Status	.219	Accept Ho	Not Significant
Course Evaluation/ Mock board Results	.805	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Table 6 reveals the significant relationship between the respondents' Board Examination Outcomes and their selected demographic profile using Chi-square χ^2 -test at .05 level of significance.

As seen, the significance χ^2 -values for the selected profile were greater than .05 which resulted to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. There is no significant relationship between the respondents' Board Examination Outcomes and their selected demographic profile age, sex, GWA, socioeconomic status and course evaluation/mock board results.

This suggests that the respondents' age, sex, GWA, socioeconomic status, and mock board results do not significantly influence their performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination. Although the above results did not statistically signify a significant relationship, it can be still deduced that among the selected profile, the sex of the respondents shows a little bit closer to the significance value of .05 than the other profile mentioned. We can therefore surmise that sex is a variable that could influence the board examination outcomes.

According to Dayaday (2018), the results of the licensure examination reflect the students' readiness to take the test, the quality of teaching provided by the faculty, and the students' exposure to practical learning opportunities through the resources and equipment supplied by the administration. The general weighted average (GWA) of graduates across various subject areas has been found to correlate with their performance in board examinations, reflecting the academic preparation that contributes to their success or failure. Faculty members play a crucial role in this process by

continually enhancing their knowledge and instructional competencies to improve student outcomes and institutional passing rates. Moreover, the implementation of strict screening and retention policies based on students' grade point averages ensures that only academically prepared candidates proceed to the licensure stage.

7. How do the following institutional factors affect to Criminology licensure examination success?

7.1 Quality Instruction

Table 7.1
Mean Distribution and Description on the Institutional Factors that Affect the Criminology Licensure Examination Success in Terms of Quality Instruction

A. Quality of Instruction	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Instructors demonstrated mastery of Criminology subjects.	3.64	Strongly Agree
2. Lessons were clearly explained and well organized.	3.43	Strongly Agree
3. Instructors used strategies that helped ne understand board topics.	3.48	Strongly Agree
4. Instructors related lessons to the licensure exam content.	3.42	Strongly Agree
5. I was encouraged to think critically and analytically	3.25	Strongly Agree
6. Feedback from instructors improved my academic performance.	3.35	Strongly Agree
CATEGORY MEAN	3.43	Strongly Agree

Table 7.1 reveals the mean distribution and description on the institutional factors that affect the criminology licensure examination success as perceived by the respondents in terms of quality instruction. The overall mean of 3.43 interpreted as Strongly Agree indicated that quality instruction plays a crucial role in the success of criminal.

As gleaned in the table, all statements are rated "Strongly Agree," indicating that respondents consistently perceive the quality of instruction as highly effective. The highest statement was statement "Instructors demonstrated mastery of Criminology subjects." with a weighted mean of 3.64 indicating that respondents strongly recognize the instructors' expertise as a key factor contributing to effective learning and board exam preparation. The lowest-rated statement, although still described as "**Strongly Agree**," is "I was encouraged to think critically and analytically," with a mean of 3.25. This implies that while instructional competence and subject mastery are evident strengths, there is a need to further enhance teaching strategies that promote critical and analytical thinking. Strengthening these skills is essential not only for licensure examination success but also

for preparing students to handle complex real-world situations in the field of criminology. Hence, educators and institutions are encouraged to adopt more student-centered and inquiry-based approaches to foster deeper understanding and independent thinking among learners.

Delos Angeles (2019) emphasized that the curriculum and the quality of instruction are significant determinants of successful performance in board examinations. She underscored that these factors play a crucial role in the graduates' success in licensure tests. It primarily focused on study attitudes and habits as key predictors of board examination outcomes, it also highlights that although study attitudes and habits are indeed vital, the curriculum design and instructional quality also have a substantial impact on students' achievement and readiness for licensure examinations.

7.2 School Facilities

Table 7.2
Mean Distribution and Description on the Institutional Factors that Affect
the Criminology Licensure Examination success in terms of School
Facilities

B. School Facilities	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Classrooms were conducive to learning.	3.55	Strongly Agree
2. The library had adequate criminology references.	2.90	Agree
3. Crime Laboratories were well-equipped.	1.70	Strongly Disagree
4. Audio-visual and technological resources were available.	2.52	Agree
5. Facilities supported effective teaching and learning.	3.32	Strongly Agree
Mean	2.80	Agree

Table 7.2 presents the mean distribution and description of institutional factors that affect Criminology Licensure Examination success as perceived by the respondents in terms of school facilities. The overall mean of 2.80, interpreted as "Agree," indicates that school facilities moderately support criminology licensure examination success. This suggests that while the respondents generally found the school facilities adequate, there is room for improvement in certain areas.

As gleaned in the table, the respondents strongly agree to the statement that "Classrooms were conducive to learning," with a weighted mean of 3.55, indicating that a comfortable and supportive classroom environment greatly contributes to students'

learning and preparation for the licensure examination. This was followed by the statement "Facilities supported effective teaching and learning," with a weighted mean of 3.32, also interpreted as "Strongly Agree," showing that respondents perceive the available school facilities as helpful in facilitating instruction and enhancing their preparation for the licensure examination.

On the other hand, the respondents strongly disagree to the statement that "Crime Laboratories were well-equipped," with a weighted mean of 1.70, indicating that respondents perceive the crime laboratory facilities as inadequate. This is a significant finding, as it suggests that the lack of well-equipped crime laboratories may hinder practical learning and hands-on preparation for the licensure examination. Meanwhile, the statements "The library had adequate criminology references" and "Audio-visual and technological resources were available" obtained means of 2.90 and 2.52, respectively, both interpreted as "Agree," indicating that while these resources were considered adequate, they were not perceived as exceptional.

Regular review and enrichment of the curriculum, in collaboration with subject matter experts, are also recommended to align instructional content with the competencies assessed in the board examination. Besides, performance is positively influenced by faculty and instructional materials. Also, that the lack of laboratory facilities/equipment was partly blamed for the examinees' poor performance according to Dayaday (2018).

7.3 OJT Experience

Table 7.3

Mean Distribution and Description on the Institutional Factors that Affect the Criminology Licensure Examination success in terms of OJT Experience

C. OJT Experience	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. My OJT experience enhanced my understanding of Criminology concepts.	3.68	Strongly Agree
2. I was exposed to actual law enforcement or criminal justice work.	3.65	Strongly Agree
3. OJT supervisors provided proper guidance and mentoring.	3.72	Strongly Agree
4. My OJT experience increased my confidence for the board exams.	3.70	Strongly Agree
5. Skills learned during the OJT were useful in answering board exam questions	3.61	Strongly Agree
6. OJT helped me apply theory to real life situations	3.74	Strongly Agree
CATEGORY MEAN	3.68	Strongly Agree

Table 7.3 reveals the mean distribution and description on the institutional factors that affect the criminology licensure examination success as perceived by the respondents in terms of OJT Experience. The overall mean of 3.68 interpreted as Strongly Agree indicated that On-the-Job Training (OJT) experience strongly supports criminology licensure examination success showing that respondents perceive hands-on training as a highly valuable factor in enhancing their knowledge, skills, and exam readiness.

As gleaned in the table, all statements are rated “Strongly Agree,” indicating that respondents perceive their OJT experiences as highly beneficial. The highest statement was statement “OJT helped me apply theory to real life situations” with a weighted mean of 3.74 indicating that respondents view hands-on experience as the most impactful aspect of OJT in connecting theoretical knowledge to practical application for board exam readiness.

The lowest rated statement, although still described as “Strongly Agree,” is “Skills learned during the OJT were useful in answering board exam questions.” With a weighted mean of 3.61 indicating that while OJT skills are valuable, respondents perceive their direct impact on board exam performance as slightly less than other benefits like real-life application and confidence-building.

This implies that OJT experiences play a critical role in preparing criminology students for the licensure examination. Hands-on training not only reinforces theoretical knowledge but also builds confidence and practical skills, highlighting the importance of real-world exposure and proper mentoring in enhancing exam readiness and professional competence.

In the study of Villarmia (2017), students also remarked that students must concentrate and deal throughout a frequent examination for their board exam. Their understanding is poor, particularly for areas studied in their first and second years. Five (5) individuals, on the other hand, stated they believed they would pass their exam. They claimed that a lack of academic achievement throughout the earlier years was compensated for by an improvement review and on-the-job training. Based on the findings, it is possible to conclude that this pioneering class was content with their four-year course because many of their goals were met throughout their studies. Respondents are also equipped for any jobs linked to their course that may be provided because they have learned most of the basic duties and obligations.

8. Which combination of factors best predict the success in Criminology Licensure Examination?

Table 8
Summary of factors that best predict the success in
Criminology Licensure Examination

Rank	Factors	MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1	Study Habits and review practices relates to Criminology licensure examination	3.58	Strongly Agree
2	Self-efficacy and Motivation predict the board exam results	3.47	Strongly Agree
3	Institutional Factors contribute to Criminology licensure examination success	3.30	Strongly Agree
	Over-all Weighted Mean	3.45	Strongly Agree

Table 8 presents the summary of factors that best predict success in the Criminology Licensure Examination. Generally, the overall weighted mean of 3.45, interpreted as "Strongly Agree," indicates that the respondents perceive these factors as significant contributors to passing the board exam.

Among the variables, study habits and review practices ranked first as the best predictor of success in the Criminology Licensure Examination, obtaining the highest mean of 3.58. This suggests that consistent and effective study routines play the most crucial role in exam success. Self-efficacy and motivation ranked second with a mean of 3.47, indicating the importance of confidence and determination in achieving positive results. Institutional factors ranked third with a mean of 3.30, also contributing to success, though to a slightly lesser extent compared to personal factors.

This implies that both individual efforts and institutional support are important, but personal discipline and mindset are the strongest predictors of success in the licensure examination. The findings suggest that while institutional support provides the necessary foundation, the respondents' study habits, self-efficacy, and motivation are the primary drivers of their success.

According to Espartero (2022), the study investigated the factors that influenced the problems encountered in the criminologist licensure examination. Through their study, they identified several factors that can influence the problems encountered by the examinees during their preparation for their board examination. Among the factors mentioned are as follows: (a) student factor, (b) home and family factor, (c) school factor, (d) review center factor, and (e) personal factor. In their discussion on what constitutes a student factor, they mentioned the following as question statements: (a) interest in the BS Criminology course; (b) time spent studying lessons; (c) doing research in the library or

through the internet; (d) number of hours spent reading books and materials; and (e) focus on the criminology course. According to them, these are considered student factors; these student factors may also be considered review habits or review attitudes toward the criminologist licensure examination or towards the criminology course itself. This study further justifies the significance of study habits, as pointed out in the study above.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the success in the Criminology Licensure Examination is primarily influenced by a combination of study habits, self-efficacy, motivation, and institutional factors, rather than test anxiety or demographic variables.

The results show that study habits and review practices are very strong predictors of board exam success, indicating that consistent studying, structured review sessions, and practice examinations greatly enhance preparedness and performance. Likewise, self-efficacy and motivation were found to be very strong predictive factors, suggesting that graduates who are confident in their abilities and highly motivated are more likely to persevere, maintain focus, and achieve success in the licensure examination.

In terms of institutional support, the findings reveal that quality instruction and OJT experience strongly contribute to exam success, while school facilities also provide moderate support. This implies that learning environments, teaching quality, and hands-on training experiences play a significant role in strengthening students' competencies and readiness for the board exam.

On the other hand, the study found that test anxiety does not significantly affect the likelihood of passing the Criminology Licensure Examination, as all its components—cognitive, emotional, psychological, and perceived impact—were either “Not Much” or “Not at all,” and the statistical results confirmed no significant relationship. This indicates that anxiety is not a major determinant of exam outcomes among the respondents.

Furthermore, demographic variables such as age, sex, GWA, socioeconomic status, and mock board results were found to have no significant influence on examination outcomes, suggesting that success is not determined by personal background factors but rather by academic preparation and psychological readiness.

Overall, the study concludes that the most powerful predictors of Criminology Licensure Examination success are study habits, self-efficacy, motivation, and institutional support systems, while test anxiety and demographic factors have minimal to no significant impact. This highlights the importance of strengthening academic preparation, enhancing student confidence, and improving institutional training programs to increase board exam success rates.

Recommendations

Based on the foregoing findings and conclusion of the study, the following are recommended for implementation:

To the Board Takers/Examinees and Criminology Students

- The study revealed that study habits and review practices greatly influence performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination. With this, students and reviewees should develop and maintain effective study habits and structured review practices, such as regular study schedules, practice tests, and active learning strategies, to improve their performance.
- Self-efficacy and motivation were found to strongly predict board exam success. With this, students should be encouraged to strengthen their self-efficacy and motivation by setting clear goals, maintaining a positive mindset, and engaging in activities that build confidence and perseverance during exam preparation.

To the SFC-Cabagan Campus Administration and Criminology Faculty

- Quality instruction was identified as a significant institutional factor affecting licensure examination success. With this educational institution should enhance the quality of instruction by providing competent faculty, updated learning materials, and effective teaching strategies aligned with board examination requirements.
- On-the-Job Training (OJT) experience was perceived to strongly support examination success. With this, schools and training institutions should continue to strengthen and support OJT programs to provide students with hands-on experience that enhances their knowledge, skills, and readiness for the licensure examination.
- School facilities were found to moderately support licensure examination success. With this, school administrators should improve school facilities and learning environments to better support students' academic preparation and overall learning experience.
- The institution should further strengthen its enhancement program by regularly reviewing students' course evaluations, academic grades, and mock board examination results. These indicators should be used to identify learning gaps early and provide targeted remediation and enrichment activities to improve board exam readiness.

Future Researchers

- The study focused on selected factors, suggesting that other variables may also influence board exam success. So, future researchers are encouraged to conduct

further studies exploring other factors that may influence licensure examination success to broaden understanding of predictors of board exam performance.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Ethical considerations guided the research design and procedures of the study. They were observed throughout the research process to protect the legal, moral, and ethical rights of all participants.

The researcher ensured that the survey was conducted with the informed consent of the participants and that their privacy was respected throughout the research process. No information was collected or used without their permission and consent. The researcher also ensured that the study was conducted in a manner that respected the dignity, rights, and welfare of the participants and that all information they provided was properly acknowledged and accurately represented.

Ethical standards were observed throughout the data-gathering process. All information collected from the participants was treated with confidentiality, and access to the data was restricted to the researcher and was limited to purposes related to the study. The researcher explained the confidentiality measures to the participants and provided them with an informed consent form before the administration of the survey. The consent form explained the purpose of the study, the rights of the participants, the voluntary nature of their participation, their right to decline participation, and their right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

The researcher also ensured that the identities of the participants were kept confidential and were not disclosed in the study. Each participant was provided with a consent form outlining the essential information about the study, the procedures involved, and the expectations and responsibilities of both the researcher and the participants. Participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any point if they felt uncomfortable or no longer wished to participate.

Finally, the researcher ensured the integrity and accuracy of the information presented in the study. The data were not fabricated, falsified, or intentionally misrepresented. Any errors or inaccuracies identified during the research process were corrected appropriately. The researcher also properly acknowledged the works of other authors through appropriate citation and avoided plagiarism by not claiming or presenting the ideas, findings, or works of others as the researcher's own.

Acknowledgments

The successful completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the invaluable support, guidance, encouragement, and assistance of several individuals whose contributions were instrumental to the realization of this study.

The researcher expresses profound gratitude and sincere appreciation to PMSgt Jay-R B. Roque, RCrim., MSCrim, thesis adviser, for his unwavering guidance, insightful

recommendations, constructive criticisms, scholarly expertise, and continuous encouragement throughout the conduct of the research. His dedication and professional mentorship greatly contributed to the successful completion of this study.

The researcher likewise extends heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Mario Q. Sevilla, statistician, for his invaluable assistance in the statistical treatment, analysis, and interpretation of the data. His expertise and guidance significantly enhanced the accuracy, reliability, and credibility of the research findings.

Sincere gratitude is also extended to Madam Sanny Joy B. Andres, MAEd-ENG, English critic, for her meticulous review of the manuscript and for her valuable suggestions that improved its grammar, organization, coherence, clarity, and overall quality.

The researcher is deeply grateful to the members of the family for their unconditional love, unwavering support, understanding, encouragement, and financial assistance throughout the pursuit of graduate studies. Their sacrifices, patience, and steadfast belief served as a constant source of inspiration and motivation.

The researcher also expresses sincere appreciation to the faculty members, respondents, and all individuals who, in one way or another, generously shared their time, knowledge, and assistance, making the successful completion of this research possible.

Above all, the researcher offers the highest praise and gratitude to Almighty God for His abundant grace, wisdom, strength, perseverance, good health, and countless blessings throughout this academic journey. His divine guidance and unfailing presence sustained the researcher in overcoming every challenge encountered during the conduct of this study.

To all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this research, the researcher extends heartfelt gratitude and deepest appreciation.

REFERENCES

- Albina, A.C., Balasabas, J.Y., Laquinon, B.J.I., Pampilo, M.H., & Caballero, L.J. (2022). Factors and Challenges Influencing the Criminologist Licensure Examination Performance through the Non-Passers' Lens. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(1): 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.1.365>
- Asuncion, R. L. (2020). The status of criminology graduates of Isabela State University in the criminologists licensure examination for the April 2010 - October 2014 examinations. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 8(10), 234-253. Retrieved from <https://garph.co.uk/IJARMSS/Oct2019/G-2754.pdf>
- Barreda, B.(2022). Academic Performance of Criminology Graduates and its Impact on the Licensure Examination for Criminologists. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, Vol. 7(5), 659–668. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344326397_DETERMINANT_OF_THE_PERFORMANCE_IN_THE_LICENSURE_EXAMINATION_FOR_CRIMINOLOGIST_IN_SOLIS_INSTITUTE_OF_TECHNOLOGY_SIT_MANAGANAGABULAN_SORSOGON_PHILIPPINES
- Briones, M.A. (2021). Licensure examination: students' intrinsic and extrinsic Factors as success predictor. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics*, 2(2): 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.56874/jeel.v1i2.52>

- Brown, A. (2019). Motivation and psychological factors in exam success. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 112(3), 456-469. <https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000332>
- Bumanglag A.M., Diwa, G.M., Ponce G.I, & Nob, R., (2018). The Moderating Role of Defensive Pessimism in the Relationship Between Test Anxiety and Performance in a Licensure Examination. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326844520_The_Moderating_Role_of_Defensive_Pessimism_in_the_Relationship_Between_Test_Anxiety_and_Performance_in_a_Licensure_Examination
- Caldwell, J.A., Caldwell, J.L., Thompson, L.A., & Lieberman, H.R. (2019). Fatigue and its management in the workplace. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 96: 272–289. DOI: 10.1016/j.neubiorev.2018.10.024
- Cassady, J. C., & Finch, W.H. (2014). The cognitive test anxiety scale: Measuring, understanding, and predicting test anxiety. In M. C. Moran & R. E. Ackerman (Eds.), *Current topics in psychological testing and assessment* (pp. 25–46). Nova Science Publishers.
- Caulfield, J. (2023). How to design and teach a hybrid course: Achieving student-centered learning through blended classroom, online and experiential activities. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003445173>
- Dayaday, M.G. (2023). Factors affecting the performance in the board examination. *International Journal of Current Research*, 10(9), 710-715. Retrieved From https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Maricel-Dayaday/publication/372890304_Factors_Affecting_Board_Examination/links/64cc9512806a9e4e5ce6ce56/Factors-Affecting-Board-Examination.pdf
- Delos Angeles, M. A. G. (2019). Curriculum and Quality of Instruction Factors for Successful Board Examination Performance. (*AJHSSR*), 3(6), 2378-703X.
- Espartero, J. R. et al. (2022). Factors that Influenced and Problems Encountered in the Criminologist Licensure Examination. *Research Gate*, 7(5). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/370497614_Factors_that_Influenced_and_Problems_Encountered_in_the_Criminologist_Licensure_Examination
- Garcia, J.P.(2020). Factors influencing success in the Criminology Licensure Examination amid the pandemic. *Philippine Journal of Criminology*, 17(1), 78-95.
- Guiyab, R. B., & Tarun, I. M. (2023). Creating prediction models for the criminology licensure examination performance using JRip rule-based algorithm and J48 decision tree algorithm. *AIP Conference Proceedings*. DOI: 10.1063/5.0164091
- Herrero, C. (2015). Influence of Selected Factors on CPA Licensure Examination Results. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*. Retrieved from <https://www.scipress.com/ILSHS.64.87>
- Hanawi, S., Saat, N., Hanafiah, H., Taufik, M., Nor, A., Hendra, A., & Azlan, T. (2022). Relationship between learning style and academic performance among the generation z students in Kuala Lumpur. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research and Allied Sciences*, 11(3): 40–48. <https://doi.org/10.51847/bznxqWlsQL>
- Kandiko Howson, C., & Kingsbury, M. (2023). Curriculum change as transformational learning. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 28(8): 1847–1866. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2021.1940923>
- Knoch, U., Huisman, A., Elder, C., Kong, X., & Mc Kenna, A. (2020). Drawing on repeat test takers to study test preparation practices and their links to score gains. *Language Testing*, 37(4): 550–572. (2020). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532220927407>
- Lascano, E. A., & Bansiong, A. J. (2017). Five-year licensure examination performance of library

- and information science graduates. *Asian Research Journal of Educational Studies*, 1(1), 1-9. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/354469581_Five-Year_Licensure_Examination_Performance_of_Library_and_Information_Science_Graduates
- Mensah, R. O., Acquah, A., Frimpong, A., & Babah, P. A. (2020). Towards improving the quality of basic education in Ghana. Teacher licensure and matters arising: Challenges and the way forward. *Journal of Education & Social Policy*, 7(3), 117-127.
doi:10.30845/jesp.v7n3p11
- Putwain, D. W., Daly, A. L., Chamberlain, S., & Sadreddini, S. (2016). 'Sink or swim': Buoyancy and coping in the cognitive test anxiety–academic performance relationship. *Educational Psychology*, 36(10), 1807–1825. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2015.1066493>
- Schulz, E.T. (2021). Addictive use of digital devices in young children: Associations with delay discounting, self–control and academic performance *PLoS ONE* 16: e0253058.
Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0253058>
- Theobald et. al Test Anxiety Does Not Predict Exam Performance When Knowledge Is Controlled For: Strong Evidence Against the Interference Hypothesis of Test Anxiety (2022). Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/09567976221119391>
- Villarmia, Jun. C. Perception of graduates in their educational experience and readiness to take the Criminology Licensure Examination. *SMCC Higher Education Research Journal*, 5, 190, 194. (2017).

APA Citation:

Acierda, A. J. R., & Roque, J.-R. B. (2026). PREDICTIVE FACTORS OF SUCCESS IN THE CRIMINOLOGY LICENSURE EXAMINATION: A STUDY OF SFC CABAGAN CAMPUS GRADUATES. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(8), 1212–1248.
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22080716>

Corresponding author: alanjayacierda15@gmail.com