

Examining the Criminology Review Program of Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College

Rosario P. Noderama^a, ^aNorthern Iloilo Polytechnic State College Victorino Salcedo Campus, Philippines, Email: rosenoderama@yahoo.com

Higher learning institutions are implementing specialised review programs for students in order to improve licensure examination performance. This study examines the relevance of the Criminology Review Program of the Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College at the Victorino Salcedo Campus in Sara, Iloilo, Philippines. Specifically, this descriptive survey-correlational study focuses on the influence of the respondents' profile to the relevance of the review program and the difficulty they have encountered in the examination. Research findings reveal no significant difference between the relevance of the review program and the respondents' profile. However, a significant difference is noted between the level of difficulty in the area of Law Enforcement Administration and the number of respondents taking the examination. Results also show a significant correlation between the relevance of the review program and the difficulty encountered in the actual board examination. It is concluded that the Criminology review program conducted by the NIPSC-VSC is a relevant tool in preparing students for the licensure examination

Key words: *Education, relevance, review program, difficulty, descriptive design, Philippines, Asia.*

Introduction

There are several ways of defining the quality of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the Philippines. One tangible and commonly used measure is the performance of an HEI's graduates in state licensure examinations (Padua, 2003). Through these examinations, the skills and competencies which are likely outputs of a quality assured HEI (Padua, 2012) could be measured to some extent. Thus, higher learning institutions are constantly upgrading and developing their learning and teaching methods to improve licensure examination performance. According to Baang (2016), passing the licensure examinations given by the



Professional Regulation Commission (PRC) can be one of the greatest achievements in a college graduate's life. The examination is intended to prove the graduates' knowledge, progress, skills and qualifications in a particular profession. Moreover, graduates' performances in these licensure examinations determine the quality of education provided by the school, which in turn guarantees the efficiency and effectiveness of its graduates' educational application into their professional careers. It is thereby suggested that a higher standard of performance by the instructional system and the consequent student performances in the licensure examinations reflect both the institution's efficiency and the students' resultant intellectual capacities.

The enactment of Republic Act No. 6506 in 1972 created the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE), a test which aimed to standardise the profession of criminologists in the country. This Act also outlines six specific areas of concentration and their relative weights in the Criminology Board Examination: 1) 20% for Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure, and Evidence (Criminal Law Book 1; Criminal Law Book 2; Criminal Evidence; Criminal Procedure, and Court Testimony); 2) 20% for Law Enforcement Administration (Police Organisation and Administration with Police Planning; Industrial Security Administration; Police Patrol Operations with Police Communication System; Police Intelligence; Police Personnel and Records Management, and Comparative Police System); 3) 20% for Criminalistics (Personal Identification; Police Photography; Forensic Ballistics; Questioned Documents Examination; Polygraph, and Legal Medicine); 4) 15% for Criminal Detection and Investigation (Fundamentals of Criminal Investigation; Traffic Management and Accident Investigation; Special Crime Investigation; Organised Crime Investigation; Drug Education and Vice Control, and Fire Technology and Arson Investigation); 5) 15% for Criminal Sociology, Ethics, and Human Relations (Introduction to Criminology and Psychology of Crimes; Philippine Criminal Justice System; Ethics and Values; Juvenile Delinquency; Human Behaviour and Crisis Management, and Criminological Research and Statistics) and 6) 10% for Correctional Administration (Institutional Corrections and Non-Institutional Corrections). At present, the CLE is conducted twice a year by the PRC. Unlike other countries, criminology and criminal justice education in the Philippines is not spared from this criterion; the country's criminology graduates are required to pass the CLE before being considered as criminologists.

One strategy currently being adopted in the Philippines to improve licensure examination performance is the implementation of a review program on campus. Bautista and Dicang (2007), who conducted a study on "Course Preparation and Review Program", concluded that review programs are pivotal when preparing examinees for any given examination. Peckley and Natividad's (2007) study "Motivational Factors among Criminology Reviewees in Attending the Board Review" similarly found that the Review Centre plays a highly important role in assisting potential examinees with their tests. Likewise, Visco (2015) posed

that the licensure examination review has a significant influence in student exposure to the examination, marking it as an essential component in student exam preparation. Tan (2016) concluded that the LET review directly influences the passing performance of those who attended the review. The same was initiated by academics Pariñas, Obrero & Obrero (2014) by determining students' preparation levels and readiness, and the relevance of the topics included in the examination to criminologists.

The College of Criminology of Northern Iloilo Polytechnic State College (NIPSC) – Victorino Salcedo Campus (VSC) has produced CLE passers since 2010 with an institutional passing percentage mostly above the national passing percentage. Criminology graduates have since been required attend the review program at an Iloilo Criminology Review Centre of their choosing. The College initiated the Criminology Review Program in 2016 in partnership with the recognised review centre in Iloilo City in order to assist its graduates in the board examination. The review program is conducted for five months and is scheduled every Saturday and Sunday. As with any review centre, the Criminology Review Program covers all six areas of concentration for the board examination as outlined by the Republic Act No. 6506. Since 2016, the institutional passing percentage was consistently higher than the national passing percentage, though some examinees still fail the CLE despite the review program. No investigations have yet been conducted regarding the review program of NIPSC-VSC in relation to these continued failures, which this study will aim to conduct.

Framework

This study is based on the fading theory that the trace or mark a memory etches into the brain is like a path made in the woods where one continually walks along the same route. If one does not take that same path, it eventually becomes overgrown until it disappears. In this vein, learned facts that are not continuously reviewed and practiced are thus forgotten.

Objectives

This study intends to analyse the relevance of the Criminology Review Program of NIPSC-VSC as perceived by its examinees in the December 2017 board examination. This relevance is analysed in relation to the performances in the six areas of concentration discussed by the reviewers. The research specifically aims to determine the following: 1) the level of relevance of the review program in terms of the areas of concentration in the CLE when respondents were taken as an entire group and classified according to their profile; 2) the level of difficulty encountered by the respondents in these areas of concentration; 3) the significant differences between the level of relevance of the review program in terms of the areas of concentration in the CLE and the respondents' profile; 4) the significant differences between the level of difficulty encountered by the respondents in the areas of concentration in the CLE

and the respondents' profile, and 5) the significant relationship between the relevance of the review program and the difficulty encountered by the respondents in the CLE.

Methodology

This study used the descriptive survey-correlational research design and was conducted in NIPSC-VSC in Sara, Iloilo, Philippines. The respondents of this study comprised of 62 intentionally-selected examinees who had attended the review classes conducted at the NIPSC-VSC by a recognised review centre in Iloilo City from May to October 2017, and who took the board examination in December 2017. Respondents were classified according to sex, age, graduation year and number of times attempting the CLE. These classifications were marked as male and female for sex; 21 years old and below, 22-24 years old, and 25 years old and above for age; 2016 and 2017 for graduation year, and first take and second take for the number CLE attempts. Respondents comprised of 42 males (68%) and 20 females (32%); 29 aged 21 years and below (47%), 22 aged between 22 and 24 years (35%), and 11 aged 25 years and above (18%); 8 graduates from 2016 (13%) and 54 graduates from 2017 (87%), and 48 first-time takers (77%) and 14 second-time takers (23%).

The research instrument was a questionnaire-checklist created by the researcher and validated by three core faculty members of the Criminology department. This instrument contains the respondents' profile and a checklist on the relevance of the topics in each area of concentration in the CLE discussed during review classes. Likewise, the checklist contains the difficulty of these topics encountered by the students on the actual examination conducted by PRC in December 2017. The respondents circled the number that indicated each topic's relevance in the CLE as discussed during the review classes and how difficult those topics were in the actual examination. For statistical purposes, respective numerical weights were assigned to the responses as follows: 1–Not Relevant/Not Difficult; 2–Slightly Relevant/Slightly Difficult; 3–Relevant/Difficult; 4–Very Relevant/Very Difficult, and 5–Extremely Relevant/Extremely Difficult.

An Informed Consent Form was also given to each respondent to ensure appropriate understanding of voluntary participation, allowance to withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason, and assurance of confidentiality. Basic information regarding the researcher like the name, contact number and email address were also reflected in the form.

Frequency count and percentage analysis were used to determine the profile of the respondents while the mean was used to analyse the level of relevance of the Criminology Review Program in terms of the CLE's six areas of concentration discussed during review classes. The mean was also used to analyse the level of difficulty of the six areas of concentration encountered by the examinees in the board examination after these were

interpreted based on the following scales of means: 1.00-1.80 as Not Relevant/Not Difficult (NR/ND); 1.81-2.60 as Slightly Relevant/Slightly Difficult (SR/SD); 2.61-3.40 as Relevant/Difficult (R/D); 3.41-4.20 as Very Relevant/Very Difficult (VR/VD), and 4.21-5.00 as Extremely Relevant/Extremely Difficult (ER/ED).

The *t*-test for independent samples was utilised to determine the significance of the differences in the level of relevance of the Criminology Review Program and the level of difficulty encountered by the examinees in terms of the six areas of concentration in two-level categories of the respondents' profile. Moreover, the *One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)* was used to determine the significance of the differences in the level of relevance of the Criminology Review Program and the level of difficulty encountered by the examinees in terms of the six areas of concentration in three level categories of the respondents' profile. Furthermore, *Pearson's Product Moment Coefficient of Correlation (Pearson's *r*)* was used to determine the significance of the relationships between the relevance of the Criminology Review Program and the difficulty encountered by the examinees in the CLE wherein the results were interpreted based on Cohen's (1998) interpretation as shown in the following: 0.10-0.29 as Small/Weak; 0.30-0.49 as Medium/Moderate, and 0.50-1.0 as Large/Strong. The .05 alpha level was used as the criterion for the acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses.

Results and Discussion

Relevance of the review program

The Criminology Review Program of NIPSC-VSC was perceived by the respondents as very relevant when taken as an entire group ($M = 3.78$) and when classified according to profile: male ($M = 3.71$) and female ($M = 3.91$) for sex; 21 years old and below ($M = 3.89$), 22-24 years old ($M = 3.79$), and 25 years old and above ($M = 3.45$) for age; 2016 graduate ($M = 3.89$), and 2017 graduate ($M = 3.76$) for year graduated, and first takers ($M = 3.74$) and second takers ($M = 3.92$) for the number of times taking the CLE. These results indicate that many items in the board examination were also covered in the review program.

All areas of concentration were viewed as very relevant by the respondents except for Correctional Administration, which was viewed as extremely relevant by 2016 graduates ($M = 4.25$) and by second takers ($M = 4.21$); Criminalistics, which was viewed as relevant by those who were 25 years old and above ($M = 3.38$), and Criminal Detection and Investigation, also deemed relevant by 25 years old and above respondents ($M = 3.24$). These results suggest that examination items in the Correctional Administration subject were easier to complete than other areas of concentration. It is also implied that Criminalistics and Criminal Detection and Investigation should be given more emphasis during the review.

Table 1: Level of relevance of the review program

Category	CJPE		LEA		Crim		CDI		CSEHR		CA		Overall	
	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc
A. Entire Group	3.85	VR	3.83	VR	3.60	VR	3.63	VR	3.76	VR	4.00	VR	3.78	VR
B. Sex														
Male	3.79	VR	3.73	VR	3.53	VR	3.50	VR	3.67	VR	4.02	VR	3.71	VR
Female	3.98	VR	4.02	VR	3.74	VR	3.93	VR	3.94	VR	3.95	VR	3.91	VR
C. Age														
21 & below	3.92	VR	3.90	VR	3.72	VR	3.79	VR	3.91	VR	4.07	VR	3.89	VR
22-24	3.91	VR	3.89	VR	3.55	VR	3.63	VR	3.74	VR	4.00	VR	3.79	VR
25 & above	3.55	VR	3.52	VR	3.38	R	3.24	R	3.41	VR	3.81	VR	3.45	VR
D. Year Graduated														
2016	3.81	VR	3.90	VR	3.75	VR	3.81	VR	3.81	VR	4.25	ER	3.89	VR
2017	3.86	VR	3.82	VR	3.57	VR	3.61	VR	3.75	VR	3.96	VR	3.76	VR
E. Number of Take														
First	3.85	VR	3.79	VR	3.53	VR	3.56	VR	3.74	VR	3.94	VR	3.74	VR
Second	3.86	VR	3.98	VR	3.81	VR	3.88	VR	3.83	VR	4.21	ER	3.92	VR

Legend: CJPE Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure, and Evidence
 LEA Law Enforcement Administration
 Crim Criminalistics
 CDI Criminal Detection and Investigation
 CSEHR Criminal Sociology, Ethics, and Human Relations
 CA Correctional Administration

Desc Description

Difficulty encountered by the respondents

Results show that the licensure examination was perceived as difficult by the respondents taken as an entire group (M = 2.99) and classified according to their demographic profile: male (M = 3.12) and female (M = 2.75) for sex; 21 years old and below (M = 3.14), 22-24 years old (M = 3.00), and 25 years old and above (M = 3.00) for age; 2016 graduate (M = 3.98) and 2017 graduate (M = 2.99) for year graduated, and first takers (M = 3.01) and second takers (M = 2.97) for the number of CLE attempts. Such results indicate that the examination was still difficult despite the assistance of the review program. This coincides with the findings of Pariñas et al. (2014) that licensure examination items were perceived as difficult by their respondents.

All areas of concentration were viewed as difficult by the respondents except for Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure and Evidence, which was viewed as extremely difficult by the 2016 graduates ($M = 3.41$). This data therefore suggests that performance in the area of Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure and Evidence tend to be lower for those examinees who have taken the exam years after graduation or later in the schedule. However, Law Enforcement and Administration and Correctional Administration were viewed as slightly difficult by first takers ($M = 2.42$) and female respondents ($M = 2.05$) respectively. This may mean that first taker examinees tend to score higher in the area of Law Enforcement Administration than second takers. Likewise, female examinees in this study performed better in Correctional Administration than their male counterparts. This finding corroborates Pascual and Navalta's (2011) study in a State University wherein female respondents achieved higher levels of passing rates in the board examination.

Table 2: Level of difficulty encountered by the examinees in the CLE

Category	CJPE		LEA		Crim		CDI		CSEHR		CA		Overall	
	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc	M	Desc
A. Entire Group	3.17	D	2.78	D	3.15	D	3.22	D	3.06	D	2.56	SD	2.99	D
B. Sex														
Male	3.27	D	2.72	D	3.37	D	3.35	D	3.17	D	2.81	D	3.12	D
Female	2.98	D	2.98	D	2.70	D	2.95	D	2.84	D	2.05	SD	2.75	D
C. Age														
21 & below	3.20	D	3.84	VD	3.06	D	3.19	D	2.99	D	2.60	SD	3.14	D
22-24	3.13	D	2.77	D	3.24	D	3.35	D	3.08	D	2.45	SD	3.00	D
25 & above	3.23	D	2.64	D	3.18	D	3.06	D	3.21	D	2.68	D	3.00	D
D. Year Graduated														
2016	3.41	ED	2.85	D	3.06	D	3.04	D	3.06	D	2.44	SD	2.98	D
2017	3.14	D	2.77	D	3.16	D	3.25	D	3.07	D	2.58	SD	2.99	D
E. Number of Take														
First	3.15	D	2.42	SD	3.14	D	3.24	D	3.04	D	2.54	SD	3.92	D
Second	3.27	D	2.94	D	3.17	D	3.18	D	3.15	D	2.64	D	3.06	D

Differences between relevance and the respondents' profile

The *t*-test results show no significant differences between the level of relevance of the Criminology Review Program in terms of the six areas of concentration and the respondents' sex, year graduated, and number of examination attempts. For the area of Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure and Evidence, the obtained *ts*(60) were 0.893, 0.153 and 0.035

while the obtained ps were 0.950, 0.269 and 0.280. For the area of Law Enforcement Administration, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 1.49, 0.284 and 0.804 while the obtained ps were 0.132, 0.437 and 0.064. Within Criminalistics, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 0.934, 0.548 and 1.076, and the obtained ps were 0.054, 0.555 and 0.169. For the area of Criminal Detection and Investigation, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 1.737, 0.581 and 1.138, and the obtained ps were 0.275, 0.339 and 0.077. For Criminal Sociology, Ethics, and Human Relations, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 1.362, 0.214 and 0.422 while the obtained ps were 0.773, 0.436 and 0.361. For Correctional Administration, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 0.276, 0.774 and 0.934, and the obtained ps were 0.859, 0.534 and 0.623, all of which were higher than 0.05. This data indicates that regardless of the respondent profiling criteria of male or female, 2016 or 2017 graduate and first or second taker of the licensure exam, these respondents' perceptions on the relevance of the review program remain comparable with the rest of the study's participants

The One Way ANOVA results also show no significant differences between the level of relevance of the review program in the six areas of concentration when examinees were classified according to age. The obtained ps were $F(2,59) = 1.102$ and $p = 0.339$ for Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure, and Evidence; $F(2,59) = 1.279$ and $p = 0.286$ for Law Enforcement Administration; $F(2,59) = 0.705$ for Criminalistics; $F(2,59) = 1.407$ and $p = 0.253$ for Crime Detection and Investigation; $F(2,59) = 1.95$ and $p = 0.151$ for Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations, and $F(2,59) = 0.251$ and $p = 0.774$ for Correctional Administration, all of which were higher than 0.05. This data similarly indicates that regardless of the age criteria (21 years old and below, 22-24 years old or 25 years old and above) respondents' perceptions on the relevance of the review program remains comparable with the group as a whole.

Differences between the difficulty encountered and the respondents' profile

The t -test results show no significant differences between the level of difficulty encountered in the CLE and the respondents' sex, year graduated and number of CLE attempts. In the area of Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure, and Evidence, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 1.121, 0.703 and 0.389 and the obtained ps were 0.057, 0.817, and 0.985. Within Criminalistics, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 2.679, 0.264 and 0.082 with the obtained ps were 0.179, 0.199 and 0.196. For Criminal Detection and Investigation, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 1.840, 0.666 and 0.229 while the obtained ps were 0.253, 0.298 and 0.211 respectively. In Criminal Sociology, Ethics, and Human Relations, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 1.351, 0.007 and 0.424 while the obtained ps were 0.152, 0.124 and 0.168. Lastly, within Correctional Administration, the obtained $ts(60)$ were 2.562, 0.335 and 0.90 and the obtained ps were 0.076, 0.854 and 0.755, all of which were higher than 0.05. This data indicates that regardless of sex,

graduation year or number of CLE attempts, respondents' perceptions on the level of difficulty encountered during the exam remain comparable with the rest of the group.

Moreover, the One-Way ANOVA result show no significant differences between the level of difficulty encountered by the examinees when classified according to age. The obtained *ps* for Criminal Jurisprudence, Procedure and Evidence were $F(2,59) = 0.050$, while $p = 0.951$; Law Enforcement Administration generated $F(2,59) = 0.176$ and $p = 0.839$; Criminalistics generated $F(2,59) = 0.216$ and $p = 0.807$; Crime Detection and Investigation showed $F(2,59) = 0.487$ and $p = 0.617$; Sociology of Crime and Ethics showed $F(2,59) = 0.235$ and $p = 0.791$, and Correctional Administration showed $F(2,59) = 0.173$ and $p = 0.842$, all of which were again higher than 0.05. regardless of age (21 years old and below, 22-24 years old or 25 years old and above) respondents' perceptions on the difficulty encountered during the exam remains comparable with the rest of the respondents.

In addition to the *t*-test results, no significant difference existed between the level of difficulty encountered by the examinees in the CLE in the area of Law Enforcement Administration when classified according to sex and graduation year. The obtained *ts*(60) were 2.047 and 0.047 and obtained *ps* were 0.238 and 0.651 respectively, data which was also higher than 0.05. This data shows that regardless of sex or graduation year, respondents' perceptions on the level of difficulty encountered during the exam in the area of Law Enforcement and Administration remain comparable with the rest of the respondents.

Conversely, a significant difference was noted in the level of difficulty in the area of Law Enforcement Administration when respondents were classified according to the number of examination attempts. The obtained *t*(60) was 2.047 and obtained *p* was 0.013, meaning that first taker and second taker examinees performed to significantly different standards in the actual examination within the area of Law Enforcement Administration. These results correlate with Pariñas, et al. (2014) in substantiating a significant relationship between the number of CLE attempts and the area in Law Enforcement Administration. These findings are represented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Differences in the level of difficulty encountered in Law Enforcement Administration and the respondents' profile

Category	M	df	t-value	Sig. (2-tailed)
60. Sex				
Male	2.72	60	0.88	0.238
Female	2.98			
B. Year Graduated				
2016	2.85	60	0.243	0.651
2017	2.77			
C. Number of Take				
First	2.42	60	2.074	0.013*
Second	2.94			

* $p < 0.05$ Significant at .05 alpha

Relationship between relevance and difficulty

Moreover, it was also noted that a positive and strong relationship existed between the relevance of the Criminology Review Program and the difficulty encountered by the examinees in the CLE ($r = .544, p = .011, p < 0.05$). This indicates that the relevance of the review program significantly influences the examinees' performances in the actual board examination. This finding coincides to some degree with the assertion of Bautista and Dicang (2007) that relevance and vital importance of the review program are needed in preparing the examinees for any given examinations. Likewise, it conforms to the findings of Tan (2016) that the LET review conducted on campus has a great impact on the passing performance of those who attended the review, and substantiates Peckley and Natividad's (2007) claims that Review Centres are vital in helping future examinees in their test-taking endeavours. These findings are further represented in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Relationship between the relevance of the review program and the difficulty encountered in the CLE

Variable (N=62)	<i>r</i>	Difficulty <i>rprob</i>
Relevance	.544*	.011

* $p < 0.05$ Significant at .05 alpha

Conclusion

From the findings of the study, it is concluded that the Criminology Review Program conducted by the NIPSC-VSC is a relevant tool in preparing students for the licensure examination. As stated by Delizo et al. (2011), reviewing is always necessary because of the many factors affecting one's memory or ability to recall the subjects taken in the undergraduate studies. Therefore, the review program is worthy to be retained to help the examinees pass the Criminology Licensure Examination. Moreover, the proposed action plan for the enrichment of the review program may be reviewed and tried out for possible implementation in the future.



REFERENCES

- Baang, M. (2016). Investigating the macro perspective affecting the passing rate in board examinations: A take-off point in designing a causal model. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 15(4), 108-120.
- Bautista, A. and Dicang, M. (2007). Course preparation and review programs of the College of Education, University of Baguio. *UB Research Journal* 2007. UB Baguio City.
- Cohen, J. W. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd edn). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 79-81.
- Delizo, et al. (2011). Tracer's criminology reviewer: a guide to passing and topping the board exam. Trazer. Baguio City.
- <http://faculty.bucks.edu/specpop/memory.html>
- Padua, R. (2003). A Quality-Based Normative Financing for State Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines. *Journal of Philippine Higher Education Quality Assurance* 1 (1). Retrieved on June 20, 2018, from <http://www.aaccupqa.org.ph/Outputs.html>
- Padua, R. (2012). Typology-Based QA for Philippine Higher Education Institutions: Through the Fabric of Instruction, Research and Extension Functions of HEI's. *IAMURE International Journal of Education* 3. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7718/iamure.ije.v3i1.216>
- Pariñas, M. M., Obrero, R. L., & Obrero, R. L. (2014). Relevance of the topics in the criminologist licensure examination review program of the university of northern philippines. *UNP Research Journal*, 21(1).
- Pascua, J. and Navalta, J. (2011). Determinants of L.E.T. performance of the teacher education graduates in a state university. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Journal*. Volume 6
- Peckley, (M.F.) and Natividad, T.O. 2007. *Motivational factors among criminology reviewees in attending the board review*. UB Research Journal 2007. UB Baguio City.
- Republic Act No. 6506 – *An act creating the board of examiner for criminologists in the philippines and for other purposes*. Retrieved on August 1, 2018 from <http://www.chanrobles.com/republicacts/republicactno6506.html#.VVELgo5Viko>.



Tan, C. (2016). *Impact of review on the performance of graduates in the licensure examination for teachers, 2012-2014*. Retrieved on August 2, 2018 from <https://worldconferences.net/home>.

Visco, D. (2015). Predictors of performance in the licensure examination for teachers of the graduates of higher education institutions in Abra. *International Journal of Management Research and Business Strategy*, 4(1), 181-191.