

Management Of Review Centers: Its Influence on Reviewees' Preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers in Region XII

Fahad U. Silongan 

Author Information:

Ministry of Basic, Higher, and Technical Education, Schools Division of Cotabato City, Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao, Philippines

Correspondence:

teacher.fahadsilongan@gmail.com

Article History:

Date Received: August 31, 2026

Date Revised: September 15, 2026

Date Accepted: October 8, 2026

Date Published: October 13, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0465>

Document ID: 2026IJROMS0465

Recommended Citation:

Silongan, F. U. (2026). Management Of Review Centers: Its Influence on Reviewees' Preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers in Region XII. *International Journal of Research on Multidisciplinary Studies*, 1(9), 270-290. <https://doi.org/10.67903/ijroms0465>

Abstract. This quantitative study examined the influence of review center management on reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers in Region XII. It determined the extent of review center management across regulatory compliance, instructional pedagogy, assessment and evaluation, and resource management, as well as its influence on reviewees' preparedness in General Education, Professional Education, and Specialization. It also examined the relationship between review center management and reviewees' preparedness and identified the most influential management practices, using a descriptive research design utilizing correlational and predictive analyses. The sample comprised 207 LET reviewees. Data were collected using a researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed through means, Pearson's correlation, and regression analysis. The findings revealed that review center management was highly evident across all dimensions, indicating consistent adherence to standards, effective instruction, sound assessment, and adequate resource provision. Reviewees were likewise highly prepared across all domains of the Licensure Examination for Teachers, suggesting that review center management practices contributed to their preparedness, particularly in areas requiring critical thinking and pedagogical competence. Correlation analysis showed a very strong positive, and significant relationship between review center management and reviewees' preparedness, while regression analysis confirmed that all dimensions significantly predicted preparedness, with resource management emerging as the strongest predictor. The study concluded that effective review center management is essential for enhancing reviewees' preparedness and performance in the licensure examination for teachers. The results show that maintaining strong institutional practices, particularly in managing learning resources, instructors, facilities, and digital platforms, helps future teachers succeed in the licensure examination.

Keywords: Assessment and Evaluation; Instructional Pedagogy; Licensure Examination; Review Center Management; Test Preparedness.

Introduction

In the Philippines, teachers who want to teach in government schools must pass the Licensure Examination for Teachers, as required by the Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994 and supervised by the Professional Regulation Commission. The examination tests knowledge in General Education and Professional Education, and for secondary teachers, it also includes their chosen subject area. This important exam closely follows national standards for teacher quality (RA 7836).

Moreover, the Licensure Examination for Teachers is a crucial exam that aspiring teachers must pass to work professionally. To help with this, several review centers now offer focused preparation through bootcamps, online courses, and blended programs. These options support both recent graduates and working professionals in different areas (Lopez, 2019)

The government first attempted to regulate review centers through Executive Order No. 566 (2006) and CHED Memorandum Order No. 30, s. 2007. These policies provided standards and guidelines for the establishment and operation of review centers and recognized their role in supporting examinees preparing for licensure examinations. However, in *Review Center Association of the Philippines v. Executive Secretary Ermita* (G.R. No. 180046, April 2, 2009), the Supreme Court declared EO No. 566 and its related CHED rules

unconstitutional. This ended the specific CHED regulatory framework for review centers established under these issuances. The change created a need to better understand how review centers manage their own operations in the post-2009 setting. In particular, there is limited evidence on how review center management practices are related to reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), especially in Region XII. Thus, examining regulatory compliance, instructional pedagogy, assessment and evaluation, and resource management may help describe how review centers support LET reviewees within this changing regulatory context.

In line with this, recent research has identified key academic factors that predict LET results. One national study of 2,780 new teachers found strong links between college preparation, GPA, and when the test is taken. This shows the importance of good training and taking the exam soon after graduating (Abao et al., 2023).

Because of this, there is growing interest in how review centers can help prepare teachers for the LET. However, studies show different findings about the factors that contribute to LET performance. Some studies suggest that structured preparation, academic performance, and program strategies can help improve LET results (Dagdag et al., 2017; Dayadaya & Sermona, 2024). These findings suggest that organized preparation and effective review activities can help examinees become more prepared for the examination.

On the other hand, other studies suggest that review programs may not fully address weaknesses in an examinee's previous teacher education. Acoba (2024) identified academic and program-related factors as important predictors of LET performance, while Binayao and Dales (2020) found differences in the experiences and preparation of LET passers and non-passers. These findings suggest that the knowledge and skills developed during teacher education also play an important role in examination performance. Thus, while review centers may strengthen and reinforce what examinees have learned, they may not be enough to address gaps in their previous education.

These different findings show that LET success may depend on more than just attending a review program. The quality of the review program, teaching methods, assessment, learning materials, and support provided may affect how well examinees prepare. At the same time, their previous teacher education and academic preparation may also influence their readiness for the examination. This contrasting view provides a basis for examining review center management practices and how these practices contribute to the preparedness of LET takers. This study examines how review centers are managed, including their curricula, faculty selection, teaching methods, student assessment, and support services. These areas affect how well examinees prepare and perform. However, there is little research on how specific management practices impact licensure examination for teachers pass rates.

Further supporting this, Camaño et al. (2024) found that how often reviews are held, the strategies used, and access to materials all help predict LET success. Alfonso (2019) noted that clear goals and accountability between colleges and their partner review centers lead to better outcomes. Other research shows that poorly managed or unregulated review centers can raise stress, use outdated methods, and lower examinees' confidence (Heretape & Paglinawan, 2024).

Understanding how review centers are managed and how this influence licensure examination for teachers' results is important. This matters not just for future examinees, but also for teacher education schools, accrediting groups, and policymakers. Dagpin et al. (2025) suggest that combining school preparation, personal study habits, and formal review programs can form a "tripod model" for licensure success.

In view of this, this study looks at how review center management strategies affect LET takers' preparedness. By identifying which management practices work best, the research aims to provide useful guidance for policies and programs that help people prepare for the licensure examination.

Research Questions

This study aims to examine how the management of review centers affects reviewees' preparedness for the licensure examination for teacher in Region XII.

Specifically, this study addresses the following questions:

1. To what extent is management of review centers in terms of:
 - 1.1 Regulatory Compliance;
 - 1.2 Instructional Pedagogy;
 - 1.3 Assessment and Evaluation; and
 - 1.4 Resource Management?
2. To what extent is the reviewees' preparedness for Licensure Examination for Teachers in terms of:
 - 2.1 General Education;
 - 2.2 Professional Education; and
 - 2.3 Specialization?

3. Is there a significant relationship between management of review centers and reviewees' preparedness for licensure examination for teachers?
4. Is there a significant influence between the management of review centers and reviewees' preparedness for licensure examination for teachers?

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

This study examined the management of selected review centers and its influence on reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) in Region XII during the 2023–2025 testing cycles. It focused on four areas of review center management: regulatory compliance, instructional pedagogy, assessment and evaluation, and resource management. It also looked at the reviewees' preparedness in General Education, Professional Education, and Specialization. The study involved 207 LET takers enrolled in formal review programs at selected review centers in Cotabato, South Cotabato, and General Santos City, including both first-time examinees and repeaters. A quantitative research design was used, specifically descriptive-correlational and descriptive-predictive approaches, with a researcher-made questionnaire as the main data-gathering instrument. The data were analyzed using the mean, Pearson correlation, and multiple regression. The study was limited to selected review centers in Region XII and did not include review centers in other regions. It also did not consider other factors that may affect LET preparedness, such as academic ability, educational background, study habits, and psychological conditions.

Literature Review

Regulatory Compliance and Review Center Management

Regulatory compliance is an important part of managing review centers, especially for professional licensure examinations like the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). In the Philippines, review centers are regulated by agencies like the Commission on Higher Education (CHED) and the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC). These agencies set rules and standards to make sure review centers teach properly and run their programs ethically. Moreover, regulatory compliance became even more important after Executive Order No. 566 required review centers in the Philippines to be regulated. This policy was created to address problems such as exam leaks and unethical behavior, necessitating stricter monitoring and accountability. Review centers must now follow set procedures, be transparent, and act responsibly when running their programs (Executive Order No. 566, 2006). In addition, the PRC also helps protect the credibility of licensure exams by regulating both the exams and the activities that prepare students for them. The decision in *Review Center Association of the Philippines v. Executive Secretary* confirms the government's right to regulate review centers to ensure fair licensure exams. This legal framework shows that compliance is required to maintain public trust in the exam system. From a management perspective, following regulations gives review centers a clear structure and helps them run smoothly. This includes getting the right permits, hiring qualified instructors, using standard teaching methods, and clearly explaining policies to students. Review centers that follow these rules are usually better organized and more consistent. Meeting regulatory standards also helps ensure their programs meet the requirements of licensure exams. Furthermore, regulatory compliance also helps ensure quality in education. In the Philippines, systems set by the Commission on Higher Education guide schools to keep high standards and be accountable. Aldaba et al. (2024) say that stronger regulation and development in higher education help schools match their programs with national goals. When review centers follow these rules, they can better teach the skills needed for licensure exams. This makes their programs more organized and helps students prepare for professional tests. Likewise, following regulations also helps review centers manage themselves better and continue to improve. They need to regularly check, record, and review how they run things and teach. These steps help review centers stay organized and provide steady services each time. Over time, this kind of management makes review centers more stable and better able to support students. Finally, regulatory compliance also builds trust and credibility. Students often choose review centers they see as reliable and reputable. When review centers follow the rules, they demonstrate professionalism and responsibility, which helps students trust the quality of their services. This trust is especially important for licensure exams, since the results affect future careers.

Learning Resources, Preparation Practices, and Readiness in Licensure Examination Performance

Many studies have looked at how students prepare for licensure exams, focusing on how they use learning materials and plan their study time. In general, Research shows that doing well is not just about having resources, but about choosing, organizing, and using them regularly during preparation. In particular, Ranabhat et al. (2024) studied how students use learning materials for licensure exams and found that using more resources did not always lead to better results. In fact, using too many materials was linked to lower

scores, possibly because it split students' focus and made it harder to understand deeply. Students who stuck to structured resources, like textbooks, did better, showing that steady and organized learning works better than jumping between different materials. Similarly, Bauzon et al. (2021) found similar results. Students who felt more prepared usually did better on licensure exams. Being prepared means not just knowing the material, but also being able to judge your own understanding. The study also showed that interactive learning, such as online lectures and peer collaboration, helped students perform better. Buying and using many different materials did not help much and sometimes even led to worse results. In the same way, Hubner et al. (2025) also found that greater resource allocation did not improve exam performance. In fact, using too many materials like question banks and videos was linked to lower scores. This suggests that having too many resources can make studying less effective, and that focused, careful preparation is more important. On the other hand, preparation also depends on students' real-life situations. In the Philippines, Gabor (2024) found that many education graduates preparing for the LET engaged in self-study due to financial constraints. Even with these challenges, they still demonstrated sufficient knowledge, suggesting that self-study can work if students have a strong academic background. The study also found that how students prepare affects their confidence and how ready they feel for the exam. Take together, these studies reveal that successful licensure preparation is anchored on intentional and well-managed learning strategies. The effectiveness of preparation depends on careful planning and smart study habits. These studies show that good preparation for licensure exams depends on careful planning and smart study habits. Success is less about how many materials you use and more about how you use them, how steady your study routine is, and how well your preparation matches the exam. Both support from review centers and personal situations matter, so it's important to look at both organized programs and self-study when thinking about exam performance.

Assessment and Evaluation

Assessment and evaluation play a key role in managing review centers, especially in preparing students for important exams such as the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). Assessment means collecting evidence of learning, while evaluation is about interpreting those results to guide teaching and improve programs. In review centers, these steps help determine if examinees are ready and support them with focused instruction. In practice, review centers use diagnostic tests, practice exercises, and mock exams to assess students. These tools help identify strengths and areas that need improvement. Research shows that regular assessment and academic performance are linked to exam results. For example, Amanonce et al. (2020) found that course grades and pre-board exams are closely related to LET outcomes. While long-term academic success is the best predictor, review assessments still help by reinforcing knowledge and finding gaps early. Similarly, Robiños et al. (2023) also found that practice tests and mock exams are linked to real licensure results. These assessments let students experience real exam conditions, like time limits and question types. With repeated practice, students get used to the test format and learn to handle pressure. However, the study noted that some students who do poorly on practice tests still pass the licensure exam, so results should be considered alongside other factors such as study habits and motivation. Moreover, evaluation is important for checking how well review center programs work. It means reviewing assessment results to improve teaching and ensure lessons align with what the licensure exam requires. Delos Angeles (2020) stressed that effective teaching and alignment of lessons with course goals have a significant impact on LET results. So, review centers should use evaluation not just to measure outcomes, but also to improve teaching and ensure content aligns with exam needs. In addition, other research shows that not all evaluation methods predict licensure success equally well. Tacadena-Muico et al. (2024) found that academic indicators such as the General Weighted Average (GWA) and On-the-Job Training (OJT) performance are strongly linked to LET results, but some school evaluation tools are less useful. This means assessment and evaluation should match the skills tested in licensure exams. If tools are not well aligned, they may not accurately show if students are ready. Furthermore, assessment and evaluation are important for managing review center programs. Good review programs regularly track student performance, so teachers can adjust their methods based on results. Navida (2022) found that schools with organized in-house review programs do better in licensure exams, especially when these programs are part of the curriculum and use regular evaluation. This shows that review centers are more effective when they use assessment data to guide their programs rather than focusing solely on what they teach. Likewise, assessment also helps students feel more prepared mentally. Taking mock exams regularly can lower test anxiety and boost confidence, both of which are important for big exams. Research shows that licensure outcomes depend on mental and situational factors, not just knowledge alone. When assessment and evaluation are done well, students get the chance to build confidence and learn good test-taking skills. Finally, from a management perspective, regular assessment and evaluation help review centers run more effectively. It helps administrators assess how well programs work, maintain consistent teaching, and use data to drive improvements. It also helps review centers match their programs to licensure exam standards, making sure students are ready for the skills they need in their careers.

Academic, Institutional, and Assessment Factors in Licensure Examination Performance

Academic preparation is often identified as a key factor influencing licensure outcomes. In particular, Camuyong et al. (2022), in their study on psychology graduates, found a significant positive relationship between General Weighted Average (GWA) and licensure examination performance. Students with stronger academic standing were more likely to perform well in the examination, suggesting that prior learning serves as a foundation for licensure success. However, the relationship was only moderate, indicating that academic performance alone does not fully account for examination outcomes. Difficulties in specific subject areas were also observed, pointing to the importance of targeted content mastery in addition to general academic achievement. In addition, institutional conditions likewise play a critical role in shaping licensure performance. Brown (2024) examined trends in pharmacist licensure examinations and reported declining pass rates associated with institutional challenges such as rapid program expansion, limited faculty resources, and constraints in training support. These findings suggest that when institutional capacity is strained, the quality of preparation may be affected, which in turn influences graduates' readiness for licensure examinations. This underscores the importance of adequate resources and effective program management in sustaining student performance. Furthermore, the cumulative nature of learning is further emphasized in the work of Jeyaraju et al. (2022), who synthesized findings across studies on medical licensure examinations. Their analysis showed that prior academic performance remains one of the most consistent predictors of licensure success. Students who demonstrate strong performance in earlier stages of their education tend to maintain this level in licensure assessments. The study also noted that continuous engagement with learning activities, including practice tests and regular review, contributes to better outcomes, suggesting that sustained preparation is more effective than short-term review efforts. Moreover, licensure examinations themselves are designed to reflect prior learning and competencies. Archer et al. (2016) found that licensure examination results generally align with academic performance measures, supporting the validity of these examinations as indicators of knowledge and readiness. However, the study also noted that while licensure performance may be associated with professional outcomes, it does not fully determine future competence. This suggests that licensure examinations should be viewed as part of a broader assessment system rather than as the sole measure of professional capability. In terms of preparatory assessment tools, Robiños et al. (2023) examined the relationship between predictor test results and actual licensure performance. Their findings indicated a strong association between the two, although some examinees who did not perform well in predictor tests were still able to succeed in the licensure examination. This suggests that factors such as preparation strategies, motivation, and testing conditions may influence outcomes beyond what is captured by predictive assessments. The study also pointed to the role of psychological factors, particularly test anxiety, in shaping performance in high-stakes examination settings. Similarly, Tacadena-Muico et al. (2024) found that not all academic indicators are equally predictive of licensure success. While General Weighted Average and On-the-Job Training (OJT) ratings showed significant relationships with LET performance, competency appraisal results did not demonstrate the same level of predictive value. This finding suggests that some institutional assessment tools may not be fully aligned with the competencies measured in licensure examinations, raising important considerations regarding the design and relevance of internal evaluation systems.

Predictors of Performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers

Numerous studies have examined the factors that influence performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET), with consistent attention given to academic preparation, instructional quality, and institutional practices. Evidence from prior research suggests that licensure outcomes are shaped by a combination of cognitive, curricular, and experiential variables that develop during pre-service education. In the Philippine context, Marie Ann Gladys Gaviola Delos Angeles (2020) found that both curriculum and instruction play a central role in determining LET performance. Her study showed that attainment of course objectives, relevance of academic requirements, and mastery of subject matter were significantly associated with examination results. Instructional factors such as teaching effectiveness and the design of learning tasks were also found to contribute to examinees' readiness. These findings suggest that preparation for licensure is not limited to content exposure alone but is closely tied to how learning is structured and delivered in teacher education programs (Delos Angeles, 2020). Similarly, Beverly B. Dionio et al. (2025) emphasized the role of academic and practical performance in predicting LET outcomes. Their study identified General Weighted Average (GWA) as a consistent predictor across examination domains, indicating that sustained academic achievement reflects deeper learning and retention of competencies. In addition, internship performance and special demonstrations were also associated with LET success, pointing to the importance of applied experiences in strengthening professional readiness. These results reinforce the idea that both theoretical knowledge and practical engagement contribute to licensure performance (Dionio et al., 2025). The strong predictive value of academic achievement is further supported by the work of J. T. Amanonce et al. (2020), who reported a significant relationship between college GWA and LET performance. Their findings suggest

that academic evaluations in higher education institutions serve as reliable indicators of students' preparedness for licensure examinations. While pre-board examination results were also related to LET performance, the relationship was comparatively weaker, indicating that long-term academic development carries more weight than short-term review outcomes. This underscores the importance of sustained academic engagement throughout the teacher education program (Amanonce et al., 2020). At the national level, Abao et al., 2023 provided a broader perspective by examining LET performance across regions in the Philippines. Their study revealed that licensure outcomes vary depending on factors such as degree program, specialization, institutional type, and geographical location. Beyond these differences, the study identified college preparation, grade point average, and test-taking conditions as relevant contributors to performance. These findings indicate that LET outcomes are influenced not only by individual academic ability but also by the context in which teacher education is delivered (Abao et al., 2023). Further insights were offered by Shiela Mae Icalina Segumpan et al. (2025), who analyzed national trends in LET pass rates. Their study revealed a widening gap between BEEd and BSEd performance, with elementary education graduates showing more inconsistent and declining results. These patterns suggest underlying concerns in program alignment, instructional delivery, and preparation strategies, particularly in the BEEd track. The study pointed to the need for stronger curricular alignment, improved practicum experiences, and structured review programs to address disparities in licensure outcomes (Segumpan et al., 2025). In a more focused analysis, C. Repuya (2025) examined the predictive role of course performance among mathematics teacher graduates. The study found that grades in professional and specialization courses are closely linked with LET results, with different domains emphasizing distinct competencies. General education was associated with intellectual skills, professional education with applied teaching abilities, and specialization with procedural and problem-solving skills. The findings suggest that specific courses contribute differently to licensure readiness, and that academic performance in these areas can serve as meaningful indicators of success (Repuya, 2025). Institutional performance and program-level practices were also explored by Gerald S. Navida (2022), who examined LET results at Pangasinan State University–Alaminos City Campus. The study found that the institution consistently performed above the national passing rate, although projections indicated potential declines if improvements are not maintained. It was also observed that higher participation rates corresponded with increased numbers of passers, suggesting that institutional engagement plays a role in overall outcomes. The study recommended strengthening in-house review programs and integrating them into the curriculum as part of sustained preparation efforts (Navida, 2022).

Trends and Institutional Factors Affecting Licensure Examination Performance

Recent research on the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) shows that results depend not only on students' academic skills but also on broader institutional and contextual factors. Across studies, findings from various universities reveal a common trend: some schools outperform the national average, but maintaining that success over time remains a challenge. For instance, F. Salendab et al. (2024) studied how Bachelor of Elementary Education graduates from Sultan Kudarat State University–Kalamansig Campus performed on the exam. They found that while the school's passing rate was usually above the national average, results changed from one exam period to another. This means that even strong institutions do not always have steady outcomes. These ups and downs may be due to differences in how students prepare, how lessons are taught, or external factors such as changes in learning conditions. In addition, the same study also found that graduates tended to perform better in General Education than in Professional Education. This difference suggests that while students have a good grasp of basic knowledge, they may need more support in applying teaching concepts. It shows that passing the licensure exam depends not only on knowing the material but also on applying teaching principles in real situations (Salendab et al., 2024). A four-year period was observed and a general decline accompanied by fluctuations in passing rates. These changes suggest that performance is influenced by shifting academic and institutional conditions rather than remaining constant across cohorts. Although BEEd graduates were found to perform above the national average, the decline over time raises concerns about sustainability. This indicates that maintaining strong performance requires continuous review of instructional practices and program implementation (Macalinao et al., 2024). Moreover, the same study also found differences between programs. BEEd results were fairly steady, but BSEd results changed more from year to year. This means that not all teacher education programs work the same way or face the same challenges. Each program may need its own approach rather than using the same solutions across all teacher education tracks (Macalinao et al., 2024). Beyond program differences, institutional practices, such as leadership and supervision, also affect licensure outcomes. F. Salendab (2021) found that school heads in private colleges provided enough instructional and administrative supervision. Still, many schools had passing rates of 50% or less. This shows that having supervision alone is not enough to achieve good exam results. What matters is how supervision leads to better classroom practices and learning experiences, not just its presence at the administrative level (Salendab, 2021). Likewise, instructional competence is another important

factor. Ana Liza Ordinario (2025) found that teachers were skilled at using modern teaching methods, especially during the pandemic. They adapted by combining traditional, interactive, and technology-based strategies. This flexibility helped keep learning going even in tough times. However, the study also noted that teachers need ongoing professional development, as effective teaching must be maintained and improved over time (Ordinario, 2025). To sum up, the evidence suggests that improving licensure outcomes requires more than meeting minimum standards. It involves sustained attention to how instruction is delivered, how programs are structured, and how students are. The evidence shows that raising licensure exam results takes more than just meeting the minimum requirements. Schools need to focus on how they teach, how their programs are set up, and how they support students as they prepare. In this way, licensure results reflect not only students' abilities but also how well teacher education programs translate their goals into real learning experiences.

Resource Management and Licensure Examination Performance

Resource management is an important dimension of examinee preparation, particularly in high-stakes assessments such as the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). In the context of review centers and teacher education institutions, resource management refers to the provision and organization of instructional materials, facilities, qualified personnel, learning technologies, and financial support systems that facilitate effective learning environments. At the institutional level, the availability and quality of resources are considered essential components of teacher preparation. Sinsay-Villanueva (2025) emphasized that effective teacher education programs are supported by a combination of curriculum, faculty competence, quality assurance systems, and learning resources. These elements function collectively to develop the competencies required for professional teaching. When institutions are able to provide adequate materials and conducive environments, they create conditions that support deeper learning and improved academic performance. Furthermore, the relationship between institutional preparation and licensure outcomes is further supported by Abao et al. (2023), who noted that LET performance is influenced by broader contextual and institutional factors. Their findings suggest that examination results are shaped not only by individual ability but also by the quality of training and preparation provided by educational institutions. This implies that resource management, as part of institutional quality, contributes to examinees' readiness across the domains of general education, professional education, and specialization. In addition, resource-related factors have also been examined in studies directly focusing on LET outcomes. Dimas (2024) identified facilities and institutional resources as variables associated with licensure performance. Although curriculum was found to be a primary predictor, the inclusion of resources in the analysis indicates that performance is influenced by multiple interconnected factors. This suggests that resource management operates alongside instructional and curricular elements in shaping examinee outcomes. Moreover, the importance of instructional materials is further discussed by Segundino (2021), who evaluated the role of review materials in LET preparation. The study emphasized that these materials serve as tools for reinforcing competencies in key subject areas. However, the effectiveness of such resources depends on their alignment with examination content, relevance to current standards, and proper utilization by examinees. This indicates that the quality and appropriateness of resources are critical considerations in review programs. From the perspective of review centers, resource management is closely linked to program effectiveness. Sappayani et al. (2025) described review programs as systems composed of interrelated components, including instructors, learners, coordinators, and resources. When these elements are properly managed and aligned, review programs are better able to support learning and improve performance. Conversely, limitations in resources may affect instructional delivery and reduce the overall effectiveness of preparation programs. Likewise, financial resources also play a role in shaping preparation. Gabor (2024) observed that participation in review programs often requires financial investment, and access to such programs may depend on the level of support available to examinees. Family support, whether financial or emotional, can influence an examinee's ability to sustain preparation, indicating that resource management extends beyond institutional provision to include individual capacity. At a broader level, disparities in institutional resources contribute to variations in licensure outcomes. Reports from the University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies indicate that graduates from less-resourced institutions tend to have lower performance compared to those from more established institutions. This suggests that institutional capacity, including the availability of facilities and academic support systems, is associated with examination outcomes. Finally, recent policy discussions further emphasize the need to strengthen institutional support. The Second Congressional Commission on Education (2026) stressed the significance of aligning licensure examinations with teacher education programs and improving support systems for examinees. These developments point to the growing expectation that institutions and review centers must manage their resources effectively to meet evolving standards in professional education.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design utilizing correlational and predictive analyses to examine both the relationship and predictive influence of review center management on reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The descriptive component examined how review centers managed regulatory compliance, instructional pedagogy, assessment and evaluation, and resource management, and how these areas were associated with reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The correlational analysis determined the significant relationship between review center management practices and reviewees' preparedness. It established the direction and strength of association among the variables. Meanwhile, the predictive analysis identified which management areas significantly predicted LET performance, determining which practices most strongly influenced reviewees' preparedness and success. The use of correlational analysis was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to examine the relationship between review center management practices and reviewees' preparedness without manipulating any variables. John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell (2018) explained that this approach is suitable for determining the direction and strength of relationships between variables as they naturally occur. Similarly, Subia et al. (2019) emphasized that this method is useful in educational research for describing current practices and examining their relationship with student performance. The predictive analysis further enabled the researcher to determine how review center management practices predict LET preparedness. John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell (2018) noted that predictive analysis is useful for forecasting outcomes based on identified predictors. By examining how management practices relate to reviewees' preparedness, the study identified which factors serve as the strongest indicators of LET success.

Research Locale

The study was conducted across several review centers in Region XII, specifically in Cotabato, South Cotabato, and General Santos City. These locations were selected because they served as key centers where many teacher education graduates went to prepare for the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). The selected review centers represented institutions with active review programs and a considerable number of LET examinees, making them appropriate settings for examining how review center management practices influenced reviewees' preparedness. Through situating the study in these locales, the research provided contextually grounded insights that reflected the actual conditions and experiences of reviewees preparing for the licensure examination.

Research Participants

The study involved LET takers who were enrolled in formal review programs at selected centers in Region XII, particularly in Cotabato, South Cotabato, and General Santos City. Respondents included both first-time examinees and repeaters. A total of 207 respondents participated in the study. They were selected from the mentioned review centers in the chosen cities to ensure that the sample was well represented.

Research Instrument

The researcher designed a questionnaire to gather information about how review center management practices influenced reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The questionnaire was divided into two main sections. The first section examined review center management practices across four areas: Regulatory Compliance, Instructional Pedagogy, Assessment and Evaluation, and Resource Management. Each area had 10 indicators that described the specific management practices used by the centers. The second section asked reviewees to rate how they performed in the LET, focusing on General Education, Professional Education, and Specialization. Each of these areas had 10 indicators. Section 1 used a five-point Likert scale: 5 for Highly Managed, 4 for Managed, 3 for Moderately Managed, 2 for Less Managed, and 1 for Least Managed. Section 2 used a five-point Likert scale: 5 = Highly Prepared, 4 = Prepared, 3 = Moderately Prepared, 2 = Less Prepared, and 1 = Least Prepared. Multiple measures were implemented to ensure the quality of the questionnaire. Experts in educational management, teacher education, and research methods reviewed the initial draft and provided feedback to improve clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives. A pilot test was conducted with 20 LET passers from review centers not included in the main study. Their feedback contributed to further refinement of the questionnaire items. The internal consistency of the questionnaire was examined using Cronbach's alpha. The pilot-test results demonstrated high internal consistency across all seven dimensions of the questionnaire. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients were 0.947 for Regulatory Compliance, 0.967 for Instructional Pedagogy, 0.968 for Assessment and Evaluation, and 0.966 for Resource Management. For reviewees' preparedness, the coefficients were 0.965 for General Education, 0.960 for Professional Education, and 0.953 for Specialization. These results indicate that

the items within each dimension demonstrated a high level of internal consistency. The questionnaire was distributed both online and in person, depending on respondents' convenience. Participation was voluntary, and all responses were kept confidential. Clear instructions were provided to guide respondents in completing the questionnaire.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data collection for this study followed a clear, step-by-step process to ensure accuracy, consistency, and ethical standards. The process started with getting formal permissions and ended with verifying and analyzing the collected data. Before collecting data, the researcher got approval from the Office of the Graduate School Dean. After that, request letters were sent to the administrators of selected review centers in Cotabato, South Cotabato, and General Santos City to request permission to conduct the study with their reviewees or alumni. The letters explained the study's purpose, participation requirements, and how confidentiality would be protected. Once permission was granted, the researcher worked with review center administrators to identify qualified respondents, focusing on LET takers from the 2023 to 2025 testing cycles who had completed a review program. Administrators were also informed about the procedures, the expected duration of participation, and how the results would be used for academic purposes. The validated and pilot-tested questionnaire was distributed in both print and online formats, such as Google Forms, to make it accessible to respondents in different locations. Each questionnaire had a short introduction about the study's purpose, clear instructions, and a consent statement that respondents agreed to before starting. Completed questionnaires were collected either in person or online within a set timeframe. All responses were checked for completeness and consistency. If any answers were unclear or missing, follow-up clarification was provided. All collected data were kept strictly confidential. Printed questionnaires were stored in a secure location, and digital data were stored in password-protected files accessible only to the researcher. No identifying information was included in the dataset or the final report. These steps followed ethical research standards and protected participants' privacy throughout the study.

Results and Discussions

Research Question 1: To what extent is management of review centers in terms of Regulatory Compliance, Instructional Pedagogy, Assessment and Evaluation, and Resource Management?

Table 1. Extent of Review Center Management in terms of Regulatory Compliance

Statement The Review Center ...	Mean	Interpretation
1. Secures and renew all required government regulations and permits.	4.52	Highly Managed
2. Complies with PRC policies governing let review operations.	4.47	Highly Managed
3. Implements ethical standards in all instructional and administrative activities.	4.49	Highly Managed
4. Communicates policies, procedures, and guidelines clearly to reviewees.	4.43	Highly Managed
5. Discusses fees, schedules, and service transparency.	4.35	Highly Managed
6. Follows standardized guidelines in conducting review classes.	4.22	Highly Managed
7. Maintains and organizes administrative systems and documentations.	4.24	Highly Managed
8. Verifies and ensures that instructors meet required qualifications.	4.42	Highly Managed
9. Documents operational processes for quality assurances purposes.	4.31	Highly Managed
10. Monitors complaints with legal and regulatory standards regularly.	4.06	Managed
Over-all Mean	4.35	Highly Managed

Table 1 shows how review centers handle regulatory compliance. The overall mean score is 4.35, which means compliance is highly managed. Most respondents believe that compliance practices are well-established, regularly followed, and effectively managed. Regulatory compliance seems to be part of daily operations rather than just a requirement. This suggests that policies, standards, and legal rules guide how review programs are run. The literature also highlights that regulatory compliance supports quality assurance, accountability, and alignment with licensure standards (Aldaba et al., 2024).

Of all the indicators, Item 1, "secures and renew all required government regulations and permits," has the highest mean score at 4.52, rated as Highly Managed. This shows that review centers prioritize legal compliance. Keeping permits current helps ensure their operations are legitimate, supports credibility, and builds public trust. The literature notes that regulatory policies, such as Executive Order No. 566, require review centers to follow standardized procedures and maintain accountability, underscoring the importance of legal compliance for institutional credibility.

Item 3, "implements ethical standards in all instructional and administrative activities," has a mean score of 4.49, and Item 2, "complies with PRC policies governing LET review operations," has a mean of 4.47. Both are rated as Highly Managed. This shows that compliance extends beyond following rules to include

upholding ethical and professional behavior. Ethical standards influence both teaching and administration, while following regulatory policies ensures that review centers meet licensure requirements.

Item 4, "communicates policies, procedures, and guidelines clearly to reviewees," has a mean score of 4.43, and Item 8, "verifies and ensures that instructors meet required qualifications," has a mean of 4.42. Both are rated as Highly Managed. This indicates that review centers actively practice compliance. Clear communication helps reviewees understand the rules, and having qualified instructors improves the quality and reliability of instruction.

Item 5, "discusses fees, schedules, and service transparency," has a mean score of 4.35, and Item 9, "documents operational processes for quality assurance purposes," has a mean of 4.31. Both are rated as Highly Managed. This shows that review centers value transparency and good record-keeping. Transparency helps examinees make informed choices, and documentation supports monitoring and improving processes.

Item 7, "maintains and organizes administrative systems and documentations," has a mean score of 4.24, and Item 6, "follows standardized guidelines in conducting review classes," has a mean of 4.22. Both are rated as Highly Managed. This means review centers use organized systems and follow set guidelines, which helps keep their operations consistent, efficient, and aligned with licensure standards.

Finally, Item 10, "monitors complaints with legal and regulatory standards regularly," received the lowest mean of 4.06, interpreted as Managed. Although this result is still positive, it is lower than the other nine indicators, which were rated Highly Managed. The result shows that complaint monitoring was the least strongly rated regulatory compliance practice among the indicators included in the questionnaire. However, the study did not examine the specific reasons for this lower rating. Therefore, it cannot be concluded from the present data that review centers do not regularly monitor complaints. The finding simply indicates that respondents rated this practice lower than the other compliance practices. This may point to an area that review centers can further examine, particularly the regular recording, checking, and handling of complaints.

The limited supporting literature on regulatory compliance in review centers should also be considered when interpreting this finding. The reviewed literature provides limited direct evidence on how regulatory compliance practices are implemented in LET review centers. Thus, the present finding provides useful descriptive information about the respondents' assessment of regulatory compliance in the selected review centers, but there is limited previous research with which to directly compare the result. The overall mean of 4.35 rated as Highly Managed should therefore be understood as the respondents' assessment of the management of regulatory compliance practices, rather than as evidence that these practices directly improve reviewees' preparedness. The relationship between review center management and reviewees' preparedness is examined separately in the correlational analysis.

Table 2. Extent of Review Center Management in terms of Instructional Pedagogy

Statement The Review Center ...	Mean	Description
1. Designs review programs aligned with the let competencies and domains.	4.48	Highly Managed
2. Develops structured session plans and review syllabi.	4.45	Highly Managed
3. Supervises and evaluates instructors teaching performance.	4.59	Highly Managed
4. Implements learner-centered strategies.	4.16	Managed
5. Standardized instructional delivery across subject areas.	4.17	Managed
6. Integrates test-taking strategies into instructional sessions.	4.48	Highly Managed
7. Encourages interactive and participatory learning activities.	4.28	Highly Managed
8. Provides faculty development program and instructional training.	4.02	Managed
9. Monitors instructional effectiveness through review sessions.	4.42	Highly Managed
10. Adjusts teaching approaches based on examinees performance and feedback.	3.95	Managed
Over-all Mean	4.30	Highly Managed

Table 2 shows how review centers manage instructional pedagogy. The overall mean score of 4.30, rated as Highly Managed, suggests that instructional practices are carried out very effectively across review centers. Respondents generally observe that teaching practices are well-organized, regularly implemented, and managed efficiently. This result shows that instructional pedagogy is planned and executed systematically, not done randomly. It points to a structured environment where teaching methods, lesson planning, and delivery match the requirements of the Licensure Examination for Teachers. This finding supports the idea that instructional quality and alignment with competencies are key to preparing examinees and improving their performance (Delos Angeles, 2020).

Among the indicators, Item 3, "supervises and evaluates instructors' teaching performance," has the highest mean of 4.59, rated as Highly Managed. This high score indicates that instructional supervision is regularly and thoroughly practiced. Review centers actively monitor teaching quality to keep instruction effective and up to standard. Ongoing instructor evaluation helps ensure teaching remains consistent, which is important for delivering accurate and relevant content.

Next, Item 1 “designs review programs aligned with the LET competencies and domains” and 6 “integrates test-taking strategies into instructional sessions” both have a mean of 4.48 and are rated as Highly Managed. This shows that review centers regularly align their programs with licensure requirements and help examinees develop test-taking strategies. This approach focuses on both content and practical application. Ensuring instruction aligns with competencies keeps review sessions relevant and focused (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Item 2, “develops structured session plans and review syllabi,” with a mean of 4.45, and Item 9, “monitors instructional effectiveness through review sessions,” with a mean of 4.42, are both rated as Highly Managed. These results show that review centers focus on organization and ongoing monitoring. Structured planning helps deliver topics systematically, while monitoring effectiveness checks if learning goals are met. These practices help keep instruction consistent and clear.

Item 7, “encourages interactive and participatory learning activities,” with a mean of 4.28 and a rating of Highly Managed, indicates that review centers promote active participation among examinees. Interactive learning helps students better understand and remember concepts. Research supports that participatory strategies improve learning outcomes in licensure preparation (Bauzon et al., 2021).

Item 5, “standardized instructional delivery across subject areas,” with a mean of 4.17, and Item 4, “implements learner-centered strategies,” with a mean of 4.16, are both rated as Managed. This means these practices are in place but may not be as consistent as others. Standardization helps keep instruction consistent across subjects, while learner-centered strategies need flexibility to meet individual needs. The slightly lower scores suggest some variation in how these are used across different review centers.

Item 8, “provides faculty development program and instructional training,” with a mean of 4.02, is rated as Managed. This shows that professional development is available but may not always be ongoing. Faculty development helps improve teaching skills and keeps instructors up to date on effective methods. Strengthening this area could further raise instructional quality, since ongoing professional development is important for effective teaching (Ordinario, 2025).

Table 3. Extent of Review Center Management in terms of Assessment and Evaluation

Statement The Review Center ...	Mean	Interpretation
1. Aligns assessment with learning objectives and examination standard.	4.27	Highly Managed
2. Uses evaluation methods that are fair and unbiased.	4.42	Highly Managed
3. Ensures reviewees receive timely feedback.	4.14	Managed
4. Ensures assessment results are used to improve review strategies.	4.35	Highly Managed
5. Practices exams that simulate actual testing conditions.	4.40	Highly Managed
6. Provides clear grading criteria.	4.07	Managed
7. Ensures reviewees are given opportunity for self-assessment.	4.15	Highly Managed
8. Ensure fairness and consistency in administering assessments.	4.29	Highly Managed
9. Assessment outcomes are communicated regularly.	4.21	Highly Managed
10. Continuous improvements are evident in evaluation process.	4.21	Highly Managed
Over-all Mean	4.25	Highly Managed

Table 3 shows how review centers manage assessment and evaluation. The overall mean score of 4.25, rated as Highly Managed, suggests that these practices are carried out very thoroughly. Respondents generally notice that assessments are well-organized, happen regularly, and are used to support learning. This means assessment is part of the teaching process, not a separate task. The results point to a system where evaluation helps both measure learning and guide instruction. This aligns with the idea that assessment and evaluation are key parts of preparing for licensure, as they help assess readiness and guide teaching decisions (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Among the indicators, Item 2, “uses evaluation methods that are fair and unbiased,” has the highest mean of 4.42 and is also rated as Highly Managed. This shows that fairness in assessment is consistently practiced. It suggests that review centers work to keep their evaluation processes objective and fair. Fair and unbiased assessments are important for maintaining credibility and giving accurate results about examinees’ performance.

Next, Item 5, “practices exams that simulate actual testing conditions,” has a mean of 4.40, and Item 4, “ensures assessment results are used to improve review strategies,” has a mean of 4.35. Both are rated as Highly Managed. This means review centers not only give assessments but also use them in helpful ways. Practice exams help examinees get used to real testing situations, and using results to adjust strategies shows a flexible, data-driven approach. This supports research that mock exams and predictor tests help examinees prepare better by letting them experience real test conditions and adjust their study plans (Robiños et al., 2023).

Item 8, "ensure fairness and consistency in administering assessments," with a mean of 4.29, and Item 1, "aligns assessment with learning objectives and examination standard," with a mean of 4.27, are also rated as Highly Managed. These results show that review centers maintain consistent assessments.

Alignment ensures assessments measure the right skills, and consistency helps ensure results are reliable. This matters because assessments should match the skills tested in licensure exams (Delos Angeles, 2020).

Item 9, "assessment outcomes are communicated regularly", and Item 10, "continuous improvements are evident in evaluation process", both with a mean of 4.21, are likewise interpreted as Highly Managed. These findings suggest that review centers regularly provide feedback and continuously refine their evaluation processes. Regular communication of results helps examinees understand their progress, while continuous improvement ensures that assessment practices remain relevant and effective over time.

Item 7, "ensures reviewees are given opportunity for self-assessment", with a mean of 4.15, is also interpreted as Highly Managed, although slightly lower compared to other indicators. This indicates that opportunities for self-reflection are present but may vary in consistency. Self-assessment is important for helping examinees become more aware of their strengths and areas for improvement, thereby contributing to better preparation (Bauzon et al., 2021).

In the lower range, Item 3, "ensures reviewees receive timely feedback", At the lower end, Item 3, "ensures reviewees receive timely feedback," has a mean of 4.14, and Item 6, "provides clear grading criteria," has a mean of 4.07. Both are rated as Managed. This means feedback and clear grading are present, but not always consistent in all review centers. Timely feedback and clear criteria help guide examinees and support their improvement, so focusing on these areas could further improve assessment practices. Research shows that feedback helps examinees find learning gaps and improve their performance (Navida, 2022).

Table 4. Extent of Review Center Management in terms of Resource Management

Statement The Review Center ...	Mean	Interpretation
1. Provides adequate and updated instructional materials for examinees.	4.26	Highly Managed
2. Maintains facilities that support effective learning environments.	4.12	Managed
3. Provides access to updated reference materials and question banks.	4.10	Managed
4. Assigns qualified instructors to appropriate subject areas.	4.41	Highly Managed
5. Manages human resources effectively to support instructional goals.	4.21	Highly Managed
6. Utilizes available technology to enhance review sessions.	4.21	Highly Managed
7. Ensures proper maintenance of facilities and learning equipment.	4.05	Managed
8. Allocates financial resources responsibly to sustain operations.	4.00	Managed
9. Monitors the use of resources to avoid wastage.	4.31	Highly Managed
10. Invests on digital learning platforms when necessary.	4.54	Highly Managed
Over-all Mean	4.22	Highly Managed

Table 4 shows how review centers manage their resources. The overall mean score is 4.22, indicating Highly Managed. This suggests that review centers consistently provide and manage resources like instructional materials, facilities, staff, and technology very well. Resource management is clearly a key part of their operations, not just an afterthought. As a result, review centers offer a well-organized and supportive environment that helps examinees prepare for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. This finding supports the idea that having sufficient resources and managing them effectively are important for effective learning and better licensure outcomes (Abao et al., 2023).

Among the indicators, Item 10, "invests on digital learning platforms when necessary," has the highest mean of 4.54, which is also Highly Managed. This high score shows that review centers see digital platforms as important for instruction. Their ongoing investment in technology keeps them up to date with modern learning needs and offers more flexible, accessible ways to teach. This supports the idea that using technology improves instruction and helps students engage more in learning (Sinsay-Villanueva, 2025).

Next, Item 4, "assigns qualified instructors to appropriate subject areas," has a mean of 4.41, and Item 9, "monitors the use of resources to avoid wastage," has a mean of 4.31. Both are rated as Highly Managed. This shows that review centers focus on assigning the right instructors and using resources efficiently. Having qualified instructors helps ensure accurate teaching, and monitoring resources shows responsible management. These practices are important for keeping review programs effective and efficient.

Item 1, "provides adequate and updated instructional materials for examinees," has a mean of 4.26. Items 5 and 6, "manages human resources effectively to support instructional goals" and "utilizes available technology to enhance review sessions," both have a mean of 4.21. All are rated as Highly Managed. This means that review centers ensure materials and staff meet instructional needs. Updated materials help students master content, and good management of staff and technology improves teaching. Studies show that well-managed resources lead to better learning environments and academic results (Segundino, 2021).

In the lower range, Item 2, "maintains facilities that support effective learning environments," has a mean of 4.12, and Item 3, "provides access to updated reference materials and question banks," has a mean of 4.10. Both are rated as Managed. This suggests that while facilities and extra resources are available, they may not get as much focus as other areas. Improving these aspects could help create a better learning environment and further support examinees' preparation.

Item 7, "ensures proper maintenance of facilities and learning equipment," has a mean of 4.05, and Item 8, "allocates financial resources responsibly to sustain operations," has a mean of 4.00. Both are rated as Managed. This means that maintenance and financial management are present but may not always be a top priority in every review center. Still, taking care of facilities and managing finances well are important for keeping review services running smoothly and maintaining their quality over time.

Research Question 2: To what extent is the reviewees' preparedness for Licensure Examination for Teachers in terms of General Education, Professional Education, and Specialization?

Table 5. Extent of the Influence of the Review Center Management in terms of Reviewees' Preparedness in General Education

Statement The Review Center ...	Mean	Interpretation
1. Strengthens understanding of core concepts in general education subjects through review sessions.	4.68	Highly Prepared
2. Enhances ability to analyze and answer General Education test questions accurately.	4.72	Highly Prepared
3. Improves reading comprehension skills needed to interpret examination items.	4.53	Highly Prepared
4. Develops logical and critical thinking skills for problem-solving questions.	4.67	Highly Prepared
5. Reinforces recall of essential facts, principles, and concepts in General Education.	4.61	Highly Prepared
6. Builds confidence in answering General Education examination items.	4.54	Highly Prepared
7. Improves speed and accuracy in responding to General Education questions.	4.53	Highly Prepared
8. Develops effective test-taking strategies applicable to General Education.	4.61	Highly Prepared
9. Supports consistent performance across different General Education subject areas.	4.50	Highly Prepared
10. Contributes to achieving satisfactory results in the General Education component of the LET.	4.40	Highly Prepared
Over-all Mean	4.58	Highly Prepared

Table 5 presents the extent of review center management's influence on reviewees' preparedness in General Education. The overall mean of 4.58, interpreted as Highly Prepared, indicates that the influence of review center management on preparedness is very high. This means that the respondents consistently perceive that review center practices significantly enhance their readiness in General Education. A mean at this level suggests that preparedness is not developed in a limited or isolated manner but is strongly and consistently supported through structured review programs. This shows that review centers play a significant role in building both the knowledge base and the cognitive skills required for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. This finding supports the view that structured preparation and guided review contribute meaningfully to examinees' readiness for licensure examinations (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Looking at the indicators, Item 2, "enhances ability to analyze and answer General Education test questions accurately," has a mean of 4.72, interpreted as Highly Prepared. This very high mean indicates that review centers strongly contribute to the development of analytical ability and accuracy in answering test items. It suggests that preparedness is not limited to familiarity with content but extends to the ability to apply knowledge effectively in examination situations. This finding may be explained by structured exposure to assessment activities. Assessment practices such as mock examinations and predictor tests provide opportunities for repeated practice and familiarity with test formats, which in turn improve performance (Robiños et al., 2023).

This is followed by Item 1, "strengthens understanding of core concepts in general education subjects through review sessions," with a mean of 4.68, and Item 4, "develops logical and critical thinking skills for problem-solving questions," with a mean of 4.67, both of which are interpreted as Highly Prepared. These findings show that review centers significantly support both conceptual understanding and higher-order thinking skills. This is consistent with findings that effective preparation depends on structured, focused

engagement with learning materials rather than fragmented study practices (Ranabhat et al., 2024; Bauzon et al., 2021).

Item 5, "reinforces recall of essential facts, principles, and concepts in General Education," and Item 8, "develops effective test-taking strategies applicable to General Education," both with a mean of 4.61, are also interpreted as Highly Prepared. These findings suggest that review centers effectively combine content reinforcement with strategic preparation. This affirms that preparation is more effective when learning resources are used in a structured and consistent manner rather than in an excessive or unorganized manner (Hubner et al., 2025; Ranabhat et al., 2024).

Item 6, "builds confidence in answering General Education examination items," with a mean of 4.54, and Item 3, "improves reading comprehension skills needed to interpret examination items," together with Item 7, "improves speed and accuracy in responding to General Education questions," both with a mean of 4.53, are interpreted as Highly Prepared. These findings indicate that review centers contribute to both cognitive and psychological aspects of preparedness. Confidence, comprehension, and efficiency are essential in high-stakes examinations, and these are strengthened through repeated exposure to assessment and review activities (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Item 9, "supports consistent performance across different General Education subject areas," with a mean of 4.50, remains Highly Prepared, suggesting that preparedness is not limited to specific topics but extends across various subject areas. This indicates that review programs provide balanced preparation across the General Education domain. This aligns with findings that institutional and instructional support contribute to more consistent learning outcomes across domains (Abao et. al., 2023).

Finally, Item 10, "contributes to achieving satisfactory results in the General Education component of the LET," has a mean of 4.40, interpreted as Highly Prepared, and obtained the lowest value. Despite being the lowest, the mean still reflects a strong level of perceived preparedness. This suggests that while review centers significantly contribute to readiness, actual performance outcomes may still be influenced by other factors such as individual effort, prior academic background, and institutional conditions. This supports the view that licensure examination performance is shaped by both preparation practices and broader academic and contextual factors (Gabor, 2024; Abao et. al., 2023).

Table 6. Extent of the Effect of the Review Center Management in terms of Reviewees Preparedness in Professional Education

Statement The Review Center ...	Mean	Interpretation
1. Enhances understanding of teaching principles and learning theories through structured review sessions.	4.57	Highly Prepared
2. Improves ability to analyze classroom situations presented in Professional Education questions.	4.52	Highly Prepared
3. Strengthens knowledge of assessment, evaluation, and classroom management concepts.	4.66	Highly Prepared
4. Clarifies complex educational concepts through guided explanations and examples.	4.72	Highly Prepared
5. Reinforces familiarity with educational laws, ethics, and professional standards.	4.64	Highly Prepared
6. Improves application of pedagogical strategies in scenario-based examination items.	4.73	Highly Prepared
7. Develops critical thinking skills needed for Professional Education questions.	4.74	Highly Prepared
8. Builds confidence in answering Professional Education examination items.	4.68	Highly Prepared
9. Improves consistency and accuracy in responding to Professional Education questions.	4.66	Highly Prepared
10. Contributes to achieving satisfactory results in the Professional Education component of the LET.	4.55	Highly Prepared
Over-all Mean	4.65	Highly Prepared

Table 6 shows how review center management affects reviewees' preparedness in Professional Education. The overall mean score of 4.65, rated as Highly Prepared, suggests that review center management has a strong positive impact on preparedness. Respondents consistently feel that review center practices help them get ready for Professional Education. A mean this high shows that preparedness is not just occasional but is regularly supported by structured review programs. This highlights the important role review centers play in building both understanding and practical skills needed for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. These results support the idea that structured preparation and guided review help examinees get ready for licensure exams (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Among the indicators, Item 7, "develops critical thinking skills needed for Professional Education questions," has the highest mean of 4.74 and is also rated as Highly Prepared. This high score shows that review

centers help develop higher-order thinking skills. It means that preparedness goes beyond knowing the content and includes reasoning and good judgment when answering situational questions. This may be because reviewees are regularly exposed to assessment activities that require analysis and interpretation (Robiños et al., 2023).

Next, Item 6, "improves application of pedagogical strategies in scenario-based examination items," has a mean of 4.73, and Item 4, "clarifies complex educational concepts through guided explanations and examples," has a mean of 4.72. Both are rated as Highly Prepared. These results show that review centers help reviewees apply their knowledge in real teaching situations. This supports research that says learning is more meaningful when concepts are clearly explained and practiced through structured instruction (Delos Angeles, 2020).

Item 8, "builds confidence in answering Professional Education examination items," has a mean of 4.68. This shows that review centers help boost examinees' confidence. It supports findings that repeated review sessions and assessment activities help reduce uncertainty and improve readiness for licensure exams (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Item 3, "strengthens knowledge of assessment, evaluation, and classroom management concepts," and Item 9, "improves consistency and accuracy in responding to Professional Education questions," both have a mean of 4.66, rated as Highly Prepared. These results show that review centers help reviewees master key teaching concepts and answer questions more accurately. This aligns with research highlighting the value of mock tests and ongoing evaluation for better performance and familiarity with exam formats (Robiños et al., 2023).

Item 5, "reinforces familiarity with educational laws, ethics, and professional standards," has a mean of 4.64. This shows that review centers help future teachers learn important rules and standards. While there is limited research on this specific area, it may be because review content aligns with licensure standards and competencies, ensuring examinees learn essential professional knowledge (Aldaba et al., 2024).

Item 1, "enhances understanding of teaching principles and learning theories through structured review sessions," has a mean of 4.57. This shows strong support for building theoretical knowledge. It aligns with findings that organized learning experiences help reviewees understand more deeply and prepare for licensure exams (Bauzon et al., 2021).

Item 10, "contributes to achieving satisfactory results in the Professional Education component of the LET," has a mean of 4.55. This suggests that review centers are seen as having a positive effect on exam results. It supports the idea that licensure performance depends on both structured preparation and wider academic and institutional factors (Abao et. al., 2023).

Finally, Item 2, "improves ability to analyze classroom situations presented in Professional Education questions," has the lowest mean of 4.52, but is still rated as Highly Prepared. This means that while analytical skills are well developed, there is still room to improve examinees' ability to interpret complex classroom scenarios. Since there is little research on this skill in review centers, future studies could further examine this area.

Table 7. Extent of the Effect of the Review Center Management in terms of Reviewees' Preparedness in Specialization

StatementThe Review Center ...	Mean	Interpretation
1. Deepens mastery of subject matter in the area of specialization through focused review sessions.	4.05	Prepared
2. Improves understanding of complex csssoncepts specific to the field of specialization.	4.24	Highly Prepared
3. Strengthens ability to analyze and solve specialization-related examination problems.	4.12	Prepared
4. Clarifies technical terms and concepts commonly used in specialization questions.	4.16	Highly Prepared
5. Enhances higher-order thinking skills required in specialization examination items.	4.48	Highly Prepared
6. Reinforces familiarity with current trends and developments in the specialization.	4.31	Highly Prepared
7. Improves accuracy and precision in answering specialization questions.	4.41	Highly Prepared
8. Develops effective problem-solving strategies applicable to the specialization area.	4.38	Highly Prepared
9. Builds confidence in responding to specialization examination items.	4.31	Highly Prepared
10. Contributes to achieving satisfactory results in the specialization component of the LET.	4.31	Highly Prepared
Over-all Mean	4.28	Highly Prepared

Table 7 shows how review center management relates to reviewees' preparedness in their specialization. The overall mean score is 4.28, indicating Highly Prepared. This suggests that most respondents feel that review center practices help them prepare for their specific field. While this mean is slightly lower than the scores for General Education and Professional Education, it still shows a high level of preparedness. Review centers appear to provide useful support in developing the subject-specific knowledge and skills needed for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. This supports the idea that structured preparation and guided review can help examinees prepare for licensure examinations (Amanonce et al., 2020).

Among the indicators, Item 5, "enhances higher-order thinking skills required in specialization examination items," has the highest mean of 4.48 and is rated as Highly Prepared. This shows that respondents feel most prepared in using higher-order thinking skills in their specialization. These skills involve analyzing, applying, and solving problems rather than simply recalling information. The high rating may be related to review activities that allow examinees to practice answering examination-type questions and solving problems. However, the present study did not directly measure which review activities contributed to this result. Therefore, this explanation should be viewed as a possible reason rather than a confirmed cause.

Next, Item 7, "improves accuracy and precision in answering specialization questions," has a mean of 4.41, while Item 8, "develops effective problem-solving strategies applicable to the specialization area," has a mean of 4.38. Both are rated as Highly Prepared. These results suggest that respondents feel well prepared to answer specialization questions accurately and to use problem-solving strategies. This supports research showing that assessment and examination practice can help examinees become familiar with test formats and improve their ability to answer examination items (Robiños et al., 2023).

Item 6, "reinforces familiarity with current trends and developments in the specialization," Item 9, "builds confidence in responding to specialization examination items," and Item 10, "contributes to achieving satisfactory results in the specialization component of the LET," all have a mean of 4.31 and are rated as Highly Prepared. These results show that respondents feel well prepared in these areas. They also show that respondents have a high level of confidence and familiarity with their specialization. However, Item 10 should be interpreted carefully because the questionnaire measured the respondents' perceived preparedness and not their actual LET results.

Item 2, "improves understanding of complex concepts specific to the field of specialization," has a mean of 4.24, while Item 4, "clarifies technical terms and concepts commonly used in specialization questions," has a mean of 4.16. Both are rated as Highly Prepared. These results show that respondents feel prepared to understand complex concepts and technical terms in their specialization. The slightly lower mean for Item 4 suggests that respondents felt somewhat less prepared in understanding technical terms than in understanding complex concepts. This aligns with research indicating that focused and structured learning can help improve understanding of subject matter (Ranabhat et al., 2024).

Item 3, "strengthens ability to analyze and solve specialization-related examination problems," has a mean of 4.12, while Item 1, "deepens mastery of subject matter in the area of specialization through focused review sessions," has the lowest mean of 4.05. Both are still rated as Highly Prepared. The difference between Item 1 and Item 5 is 0.43, with higher-order thinking skills receiving the higher rating (4.48) than subject-matter mastery (4.05). This suggests that respondents feel more prepared to use higher-order thinking skills than to achieve deeper mastery of their specialization subject matter. One possible explanation is that higher-order thinking skills can be practiced through review questions and problem-solving activities, while deeper mastery of subject matter may require longer-term learning through formal coursework, previous learning, and continued study. Research on LET performance also shows that college preparation and academic background are related to examination performance (Abao et al., 2023). However, these factors were not directly measured in the present study, so they cannot be confirmed as the reason for the lower rating.

Research Question 3: Is there a significant relationship between management of review centers and reviewees' preparedness for licensure examination for teachers?

Table 8. Relationship between Review Center Management and Reviewees' Preparedness for Licensure Examination for Teachers

Independent Variables		Correlation with Dependent Variable (r)	Strength of Relationship
1. Regulatory Compliance	Pearson Correlation	0.935**	Very Strong Positive Correlation
	Significance (2 tailed)	.000	Highly Significant
2. Instructional Pedagogy	Pearson Correlation	0.912**	Very Strong Positive Correlation
	Significance (2 tailed)	.000	Highly Significant
3. Assessment and Evaluation	Pearson Correlation	0.954**	Very Strong Positive Correlation
	Significance (2 tailed)	.000	Highly Significant
4. Resource Management	Pearson Correlation	0.966**	Very Strong Positive Correlation
	Significance (2 tailed)	.000	Highly Significant

Table 8 shows how review center management relates to reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. All four management areas show very strong positive correlations with preparedness, with correlation coefficients ranging from 0.912 to 0.966. All p-values are 0.000, indicating the results are highly significant and not due to chance. These findings suggest that better review center management leads to higher preparedness among reviewees. The consistently high correlation values indicate a strong, stable relationship across all areas, underscoring the importance of well-managed review programs for licensure preparation. This supports the idea that preparedness is influenced by both institutional practices and structured learning environments (Abao et al., 2023).

Resource Management has the highest correlation with preparedness, with an r value of 0.966, showing a very strong positive link. This means that having enough resources, organizing them well, and using them effectively are closely tied to how ready examinees feel. When review centers offer good materials, skilled instructors, and a supportive environment, examinees are more likely to feel confident and prepared. This finding aligns with previous studies on the key role of resource management in supporting licensure outcomes (Sinsay-Villanueva, 2025).

Assessment and Evaluation come next, with an r-value of 0.954, indicating a very strong positive correlation. This means that how review centers assess learning and give feedback is closely connected to preparedness. Good assessment practices, such as mock exams and ongoing evaluation, help examinees identify their strengths and areas for improvement. Research shows that tools such as predictor tests and simulated exams help examinees prepare by allowing them to experience real testing conditions and adjust their study strategies (Robiños et al., 2023).

Regulatory Compliance has an r value of 0.935, which is also a very strong positive correlation. This means that following policies, ethical standards, and regulations is strongly linked to preparedness. Compliance creates a structured system that helps organize programs and ensure they meet licensure requirements. Studies have found that regulatory systems encourage accountability, consistency, and quality, all of which help improve preparation (Aldaba et al., 2024).

Instructional Pedagogy has an r value of 0.912, which is still a very strong positive correlation, though slightly lower than the others. This shows that teaching methods, lesson organization, and content delivery all play a big role in how prepared examinees feel. Good teaching makes learning organized, relevant, and suited to examinees' needs, which is important for getting ready for the licensure exam (Delos Angeles, 2020).

Taking together, the results show a clear pattern: all parts of review center management are strongly linked to reviewees' preparedness. The strong positive correlations suggest that improving any of these areas can increase preparedness. Still, it is important to remember that correlation does not mean causation. Preparedness can also be affected by factors such as past academic performance, study habits, and examinees' engagement with learning materials. Research points out that preparation depends not just on support from the institution but also on how examinees use resources and keep up their study routines (Ranabhat et al., 2024).

Research Question 4: Is there a significant influence between the management of review centers and reviewees' preparedness for licensure examination for teachers?

Table 9. Full Model Regression Analysis of Review Center Management Predicting Reviewees' Preparedness in the Licensure Examination for Teachers

Independent Variable	Beta Coefficient (β)	t-value	R ²	p-value	Interpretation
1. Regulatory Compliance	0.935	37.743	.874	.000	Significant
2. Instructional Pedagogy	0.912	31.909	.832	.000	Significant
3. Assessment and Evaluation	0.954	45.317	.909	.000	Significant
4. Resource Management	0.966	53.241	.933	.000	Significant
R ² = .887 F=2834.619 df (2); p<.000					

Table 9 shows the full regression analysis for predicting reviewees' preparedness in the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The model has an R² of .887, meaning that 88.7% of the variation in preparedness is explained by review center management factors. The model is statistically significant (F = 2834.619, p < .000), showing that these predictors together have a strong influence on reviewees' preparedness. This means that review center management plays a major role in helping reviewees' prepare for the licensure exam. The high explanatory value suggests that structured and well-managed review programs have a big impact, supporting the idea that preparation practices are important for licensure outcomes (Amanonce et. al., 2020).

Among the predictors, Resource Management has the highest beta coefficient (β = 0.966, t = 53.241, p = .000), making it the strongest factor for reviewees' preparedness. This means that having and using learning materials, facilities, and support systems well has the biggest impact on examinees' readiness. This supports research showing that resources and support are key to good licensure exam performance (Abao et. al., 2023). When resources are managed well, they help create a learning environment that supports ongoing preparation.

Assessment and Evaluation come next, with a beta coefficient of (β = 0.954, t = 45.317, p = .000), showing it also strongly predicts preparedness. This means that practices like mock exams, diagnostic tests, and feedback help examinees get ready. Research shows that regular assessment and practice under exam conditions improve familiarity, reduce anxiety, and boost performance (Robiños et al., 2023). Assessment also lets review centers track progress and adjust teaching methods to fit examinees' needs.

Regulatory Compliance also has a strong influence, with a beta coefficient of (β = 0.935, t = 37.743, p = .000). This means that following policies, standards, and regulations is important for preparedness. Research supports that compliance helps ensure quality, consistency, and alignment with licensure requirements, which helps examinees prepare (Aldaba et. al., 2024).

Instructional Pedagogy has a beta coefficient of (β = 0.912, t = 31.909, p = .000), making it another important predictor. This shows how instruction is delivered, including teaching methods, lesson organization, and matching lessons to competencies, helps improve preparedness. Research also finds that good instructional design and delivery lead to better learning and licensure results (Delos Angeles, 2020).

All variables have p-values of .000, indicating that each predictor is statistically significant. This means every part of review center management helps explain reviewees' preparedness for the licensure examination. The high beta coefficients also suggest these factors work together to make examinees more ready.

The results show that review center management has a strong and significant effect on reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The high R² value confirms the model explains much of the variation, with Resource Management as the top predictor, followed by Assessment and Evaluation, Regulatory Compliance, and Instructional Pedagogy. This means preparedness depends on adequate resources, effective assessment, adherence to standards, and quality teaching.

The regression model leaves 11.3% of the variance in reviewees' reported preparedness unexplained. This gap indicates that factors outside the four review center management dimensions may also be related to preparedness. Possible omitted variables include individual study habits, prior academic preparation, time spent studying, motivation, confidence, test anxiety, and other psychological conditions. Individual study habits, for example, may affect how reviewees use the lessons, materials, and activities provided by the review center. Likewise, psychological conditions such as test anxiety, confidence, and motivation may affect how reviewees perceive and respond to their preparation. However, these factors were not measured in the present study; therefore, their specific contribution to the 11.3% unexplained variance cannot be determined. The remaining variance should therefore be viewed as an indication that reviewees' preparedness may also be influenced by individual and other contextual factors beyond review center management. Future studies may include these variables to provide a more complete explanation of differences in LET preparedness.

Ethical Considerations

This study followed proper ethical practices to protect the rights, privacy, and well-being of the participants. Before conducting the study, the researcher obtained approval from the Office of the Graduate School Dean. Permission was also requested from the administrators of the selected review centers in Cotabato, South Cotabato, and General Santos City. The researcher explained the purpose of the study, the activities involved, the time needed to answer the questionnaire, and how the results would be used. Participation in the study was voluntary. The respondents were given a consent statement before answering the questionnaire. They were informed that joining the study was their choice and that they could decide whether or not to participate. The questionnaire was given either in person or online through Google Forms, depending on what was more convenient for the respondents. The privacy of the respondents was also protected. Their names and other information that could identify them were not included in the data or in the final report. All answers were kept confidential and were used only for this study. Printed questionnaires were kept in a safe place, while digital files were stored in password-protected files that could only be accessed by the researcher. The researcher also made sure that the participants were not placed under pressure or exposed to any harm while taking part in the study. The questions focused only on the management of review centers and the preparedness of LET reviewees. The respondents were given clear instructions and enough time to answer the questionnaire comfortably. Lastly, the researcher followed the principles of honesty, fairness, and respect throughout the study. The responses were recorded, organized, and analyzed based on the actual answers of the participants. No data were changed, added, or removed to influence the results. All findings were reported honestly and used only for academic and research purposes. In this way, the study respected the rights and privacy of the participants and maintained the integrity of the research process.

Conclusion

This study examined how review center management influenced reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers. The results showed that review center management mean values were high in all areas. Reviewees were also well prepared in General Education, Professional Education, and Specialization, with the highest preparedness in Professional Education. The results showed a very strong and significant link between review center management and reviewees' preparedness, so the null hypothesis about their relationship was rejected. Regression analysis also found a significant influence, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis about influence. Among the variables, resource management was the strongest predictor. Effective management in review centers helped reviewees gain more knowledge, build stronger critical thinking skills, and become better prepared for the Licensure Examination for Teachers, leading to improved performance in the examination.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the study recommended that review center administrators and instructors strengthen their programs by giving greater attention to subject-matter mastery in Specialization. They were encouraged to provide focused review sessions on difficult and technical topics, use additional practice questions, and include problem-solving, application-based, and guided discussion activities. Teacher Education Institutions (TEIs) were advised to strengthen the connection between their curricula and appropriate strategies used in LET review programs by giving greater attention to LET competencies, subject-matter mastery, analytical skills, problem-solving, practice examinations, scenario-based activities, and higher-order thinking. Reviewees were encouraged to spend more time studying their specialization subjects and regularly practice answering examination-related questions to strengthen their preparedness. Future researchers were encouraged to examine other factors that may be related to LET preparedness, such as individual study habits, prior academic preparation, time spent studying, motivation, confidence, and test anxiety, which were not measured in the present study. They were also encouraged to include actual LET examination results and respondents from additional review centers and regions. These recommendations aimed to strengthen review center management, improve the connection between pre-service teacher education and LET preparation, and provide a more complete understanding of the factors related to reviewees' preparedness for the Licensure Examination for Teachers.

References

- Abao, E. L., Petancio, J. M., Sanchez, J. M., & Sumalinog, G. G. (2023). Performance of beginning teachers in the Licensure Examination for Teachers: A national study. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1240658. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1240658>

- Acoba, R. P. (2024). Predictors of Licensure Examination for Teachers: A comparative analysis of multiple linear regression and artificial neural network. *Isabela State University Linker: Journal of Education, Social Sciences and Allied Health*, 1(2), 86–100. <https://doi.org/10.65141/jessahv1i2n7>
- Aldaba, F., Sescon, J., & Alconis, K. (2024). Strengthening CHED's developmental and regulatory capacity (Discussion Paper Series No. 2024-41). Philippine Institute for Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2024.41>
- Alfonso, N. V. (2019). Policies, practices of teacher education institutions and the performance of their graduates. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 4(3), 621–634. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.4.3.12>
- Amanonce, J. T., & Maramag, A. M. (2020). Licensure examination performance and academic achievement of teacher education graduates. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(3), 510–516. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i3.20614>
- Archer, J., Lynn, N., Coombes, L., Roberts, M., Gale, T., Price, T., & De Bere, S. (2016). The impact of large-scale licensing examinations in highly developed countries: A systematic review. *BMC Medical Education*, 16, Article 212. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-016-0729-7>
- Bauzon, J., Alver, A., Ravikumar, V., Devera, A., Mikhael, T., Nauman, R., & Simanton, E. (2021). The impact of educational resources and perceived preparedness on medical education performance. *Medical Science Educator*, 31, 1319–1326. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-021-01306-x>
- Binayao, B. S., & Dales, Z. I. (2020). A phenomenological study of the passers and non-passers in the Licensure Examination for Teachers. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 5(8), 1704–1721. <https://doi.org/10.38124/IJISRT20AUG828>
- Brown, D. L. (2024). Falling pass rates on the North American Pharmacist Licensure Examination signal an emerging crisis for a growing number of pharmacy schools. *Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy*, 7(10), 1033–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.2015>
- Camañero, R. T., Berico, A. M., & Tan, D. A. (2024). Predictors of licensure examination performance of Bachelor's in Education graduates of a community college in Bukidnon, Philippines. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(10), 821–831. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8100067>
- Camuyong, C., Adlawan, J., Reyes, K., Magtalas, S., & Decena, C. (2022). Six-year comparative analysis of licensure examination performance: The case of PRMSU BLEPP takers. *South Asian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(4), 62–69. <https://doi.org/10.48165/sajssh.2022.3405>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dagdag, J. D., Sarmiento, C. S., & Ibale, J. C. (2017). Examining the factors of Licensure Examination for Teachers performance for program strategy enhancement. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 5(4), 34–39.
- Dayadaya, R. M. N., & Sermona, N. L. D. (2024). Graduates' perspectives of the institutional intervention for the improvement of the Licensure Examination for Teachers' performance. *Science-International (Lahore)*, 36(3), 343–345.
- Delos Angeles, M. A. G. (2020). Predictors of performance in Licensure Examination for Teachers. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 8(3), 835–843. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2020.080314>
- Dimas, R. B. (2024). Factors affecting the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) performance of BSEd graduates. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2), 14556–14561. <https://doi.org/10.57239/PJLSS-2024-22.2.001047>
- Dionio, B. B., Dagpin, A. R. R., Cabillas, A. J. Q. B., Edullantes, J. R. T., & Baluyos, G. R. (2025). Predictors of graduates' performance in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 5(1), 79–103. <https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.eduline3535>
- Executive Order No. 566. (2006). Directing the Commission on Higher Education to regulate the establishment and operation of review centers and providing for other purposes. Office of the President of the Philippines.
- Fernando, J. S. (2021). Compliance of higher education institutions to outcome-based education for the 21st century learners. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 3(2), 226–236. <https://doi.org/10.54476/iimrj304>
- Gabor, E. F. (2024). Practices and readiness of Pamantasan ng Cabuyao education graduates in licensure examination: Basis for action plan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Analysis*, 7(1), 355–366. <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmra/v7-i01-44>
- Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. In *Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education* (pp. 82–88).

- Heretape, E. H., & Paglinawan, J. L. (2024). Academic support services and review program initiatives on students' preparedness for licensure examination. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 7(11), 185–196. <https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2024.71117>
- Hubner, B., Tolman, Z., Cherkaoui, O., Lee, E., Stokes, A., Klatt, C., & Klatt, E. (2025). Exploring students' use of medical education resources for the USMLE Step 2 CK exam preparation. *Medical Science Educator*, 35(3), 1597–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-025-02362-3>
- Jeyaraju, M., Linford, H., Mendes, T., Caufield-Noll, C., & Tackett, S. (2023). Factors leading to successful performance on U.S. national licensure exams for medical students: A scoping review. *Academic Medicine*, 98(1), 136–148. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000004877>
- Lopez, A. B. A. (2019). Perceptions of students to open and distance learning of review classes in a review center in the Philippines. *International Journal on Open and Distance e-Learning*, 5(1).
- Macalinao, Z. A., Abagon, B., Dalusong, R., Laguer, P., Parangat, K., Charcos, C. M., & Dantic, M. J. P. (2024). Trends and comparative analysis in College of Teacher Education graduates' licensure examination performance (2021–2024). *East African Scholars Journal of Education, Humanities and Literature*, 7(11), 348–354. <https://doi.org/10.36349/easjehl.2024.v07i11.001>
- Navida, G. S. (2022). Status and trends of Teacher Education Board performance of Pangasinan State University Alaminos City Campus. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 5(7), 22–31. <https://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2022.5703>
- Ordinario, A. L. (2025). Extent of utilization and level of competence in 21st-century instructional pedagogies amidst the pandemic: A cultural lens on higher education educators. *International Journal on Culture, History, and Religion*, 7(SI3), 528–545. <https://doi.org/10.63931/ijchr.v7iSI3.405>
- Ranabhat, S., Kunjukrishnan, M., Dubey, M., Curran, V., Dubey, A., & Dwivedi, N. (2024). Exploring the usage of learning resources by medical students in the basic science stage and their effect on academic performance. *BMC Medical Education*, 24, Article 543. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05511-1>
- Repuya, C. R. (2025). Predicting Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) outcomes: A regression analysis of mathematics teacher graduates' course performance and LET results. *Participatory Educational Research*, 12(4), 151–167. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.25.54.12.4>
- Republic Act No. 7836. (1994). Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act of 1994. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines.
- Review Center Association of the Philippines v. Executive Secretary, G.R. No. 180046 (2009). Supreme Court of the Philippines.
- Salendab, F. A. (2021). Performance of private higher education institutions and the school heads' supervision in South Central Mindanao. *Psychology and Education Journal*, 58(3), 3980–3997. <https://doi.org/10.17762/pae.v58i3.4602>
- Salendab, F. A., & Cogo, D. A. (2024). Examining the success rates in Licensure Examination for Teachers: A quantitative focus on Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEED) graduates. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(9), 3615–3623. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.09.21>
- Sappayani, A. V., Bustamante, G. B., & Elesio, J. M. (2024). Delving into review coordinators' dynamics: A system theory analysis LET preparation programs in Davao City's private non-sectarian higher education landscape. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(12), 4629–4642. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8120388>
- Second Congressional Commission on Education. (2026). EDCOM II bats for urgent reforms in teacher licensure exam.
- Segundino, P. J. T., Mondragon, V., Carnaje, A. C., Silaya, S. G., Panagiton, C., Seiton, A., & Servano, A. (2021). Evaluation of selected institutional Licensure Examination for Teachers review materials. *Globus Journal of Progressive Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.46360/globus.edu.220211007>
- Segumpan, S., Tac-An, T., Tidal, A., Trasmonte, C., & Mahinay, R. (2025). Licensure Exam for Teachers (LET) elementary and secondary performance: Implications for teacher preparation. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 3(9), 290–300.
- Sinsay-Villanueva, L. (2025). Quality education starting with teacher education. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
- Tacadena-Muico, J. E., Chan, L. V., & Camacho, A. (2024). The correlation analysis between students' performance and licensure examination result of BEED graduates in UM Panabo College. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 2513–2521. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.8100209>
- University of the Philippines Center for Integrative and Development Studies. (2023). Teacher education in the Philippines: Are we meeting the demand for quality? University of the Philippines.