

Impact Of In-House Review Programs on the Licensure Examination Readiness of Pre-Service Teachers

Nurhaida J. Haliddin¹

Tawi-Tawi Regional Agricultural College, Bongao, Tawi-Tawi, Philippines¹

¹ORCID ID No.: 597-602-597-602

*Corresponding author: Nurhaida J. Haliddin¹
tracnurhaida@gmail.com

HOW TO CITE:

Nurhaida J. Haliddin (2026). Impact Of In-House Review Programs on the Licensure Examination Readiness of Pre-Service Teachers. International Journal of Special Education, 41(14s), 597-602

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors.
Open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT:

Purpose: This study evaluated the effectiveness of the in-house review program in improving the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) readiness of pre-service teachers at Tawi-Tawi Regional Agricultural College (TRAC). **Methodology:** A one-group pretest-posttest quasi-experimental design was used. Data were collected from 27 pre-service teachers using a standardized LET pre-board examination as both pretest and posttest. Descriptive statistics and the paired samples t-test were employed to analyze the data. **Findings:** Results showed an increase in mean scores from 45.90% (pretest) to 65.98% (posttest), indicating modest improvement across most subject areas. However, statistical analysis revealed no significant difference between pretest and posttest scores ($p = 0.42 > 0.05$). The greatest gains were observed in Filipino, English, and Mathematics, while Science showed minimal improvement. **Practical Value:** The program provided structured review support and identified specific subject areas needing more focus. The findings serve as baseline data to refine future review strategies, especially for institutions in low-performing regions like BARMM, where pass rates remain a concern.

Keywords: Teacher Education, Pre-service Teacher, Licensure Examination for Teachers, In-house Review, Mentoring, Coaching, BARMM

Introduction

The Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET) is the primary gateway to the teaching profession in the Philippines, mandated by Republic Act No. 7836 (1994) or the “Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act.” It ensures that only qualified individuals enter the profession, setting national standards for knowledge and competence (Antiojo, 2017; PRC, 2024). Administered twice a year by the Professional Regulation Commission (PRC), the examination

covers two major domains: General Education and Professional Education.

In recent years, passing rates in the BARMM region have consistently been lower than the national average. Generalao et al. (2022) noted that regional disparities in LET performance are significant, with Mindanao institutions facing unique challenges in resources and review support. At Tawi-Tawi Regional Agricultural College, historical data from 2016 showed passing rates as low as 1.3% for Elementary and

2.6% for Secondary takers, highlighting the urgent need for intervention (PRC, 2016).

Research Gap and Significance

Most existing studies on LET preparation focus on large universities or institutions in Luzon and Visayas. There is limited research conducted in small state colleges within the BARMM region that specifically evaluates the effectiveness of internal, institution-led review programs. Many studies only report correlations between grades and LET performance, but few document the process, structure, and outcomes of in-house review interventions.

This study is important because it provides empirical evidence on whether internal review programs can improve readiness in resource-constrained settings. It differs from previous research by detailing the implementation process, identifying specific subject weaknesses, and presenting both descriptive improvements and statistical results—offering a realistic assessment of what works and what needs adjustment. The findings will help TRAC and similar institutions design more effective review programs tailored to their students' needs.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on Mastery Learning Theory (Bloom, 1968; updated by Guskey, 2023), which posits that given sufficient time, appropriate materials, and guided instruction, most learners can achieve high levels of competence. It is also supported by Andragogy (Knowles et al., 2020), which emphasizes self-directed learning and relevance of content—key principles in review programs for adult learners.

Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this study is to determine the impact of the in-house review program on the LET readiness of pre-service teachers at TRAC.

Specifically, it aims to:

1. Describe the demographic profile of the respondents.
2. Determine the level of readiness before the review program (pretest).

3. Determine the level of readiness after the review program (posttest).

4. Identify areas of strength and weakness based on test results.

5. Compare pretest and posttest scores to measure significant improvement.

6. Provide recommendations to improve future review programs.

Methodology

Research Design

This study uses a one-group pretest-posttest quasi-experimental design (Creswell & Creswell, 2024). This design is appropriate to measure changes in performance after exposure to an intervention, even without a control group, making it suitable for small populations in action research settings.

Participants and Sampling

Total enumeration was used, including all 27 pre-service teachers enrolled in Ag. Educ. 402 (Practice Teaching) for A.Y. 2018–2019. This ensures that all eligible students participated, eliminating sampling bias. Inclusion criteria: (a) officially enrolled in the program, (b) intending to take the LET, and (c) willing to sign informed consent.

Research Instrument

The instrument used was the St. Louise's LET Pre-board Examination (2018), a standardized, commercially available test aligned with the PRC LET table of specifications. For validation, the test is externally validated and widely used by teacher education institutions; its alignment with LET standards was verified by three TRAC faculty members holding Master's degrees and with prior LET review experience. In terms of reliability, the test has a reported Cronbach's Alpha = 0.85 from its source, confirming acceptable internal consistency. Structurally, it consists of 330 items covering General Education, which includes English, Filipino, Math, Science, and Social Studies, as well as Professional Education.

Description of the Intervention

The intervention follows a detailed program structure with a total duration of 14 days of intensive review, conducted Monday through Friday from 9:00 AM to 12:00 NN, with adjustments made to accommodate Ramadan observance. The schedule allocates 2 hours per subject, with 2 subjects covered each day. Topics covered include General Education: Grammar & Composition, Literature, and Reading Comprehension under English; Vocabulary, Grammar, Panitikan, and Wika at Kulturang Pilipino under Filipino; Fundamental Operations, Algebra, Geometry, Trigonometry, and Statistics under Mathematics; Biological, Physical, and Earth Science; and Philippine History, Economics, Geography, and Politics under Social Studies. It also covers Professional Education: Child & Adolescent Development, Principles of Teaching, Curriculum Development, Assessment of Learning, Educational Technology, and Social Dimensions of Education. Implemented activities include lecture-review, concept mapping, drills and practice tests, Q&A sessions,

and individual coaching for students with identified difficulties.

Data Collection Procedure

For the pre-intervention stage, an orientation was held, informed consent was obtained, and the pretest was administered on Day 1 to establish baseline performance. During the intervention, review sessions were conducted daily for 14 days, with attendance monitored and progress checked through short quizzes. For the post-intervention stage, the same test was administered as the posttest on Day 15 to measure change. Collected scores were tabulated, computed for means and percentages, and analyzed using the paired samples t-test at a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations

Approval for the study was secured from the TRAC Research Committee and Department Chair. Participation was voluntary, with no academic penalty imposed for non-participation. All gathered data were anonymized, kept strictly confidential, and used solely for research purposes.

Results and Discussion

Pretest Results: Baseline Readiness

Table 1 Level of Readiness Before the Review Program (Pretest)

Subject Area	No. of Items	Mean Score	Percentage	Interpretation
Professional Education	150	102.82	68.55%	Moderately Ready
Social Studies	30	18.76	62.55%	Moderately Ready
Science	30	14.52	48.40%	Below Average
English	30	10.68	35.60%	Poor
Filipino	30	8.93	30.50%	Poor
Mathematics	30	9.15	29.75%	Poor
Overall	330	45.90	45.90%	Below Average

Discussion

The pretest results show that students were strongest in Professional Education and Social Studies, likely because these are core subjects taken throughout their degree program. English,

Filipino, and Mathematics were the weakest areas, consistent with findings of Ulla et al. (2022) and Soriano & Dela Cruz (2023), who noted that language and computational skills are often underdeveloped in regional colleges.

Posttest Results: Readiness After Intervention

Table 2 Level of Readiness After the Review Program (Posttest)

Subject Area	No. of Items	Mean Score	Percentage	Interpretation
Professional Education	150	119.40	79.60%	Ready
Filipino	30	22.30	74.35%	Ready
English	30	20.25	67.50%	Moderately Ready
Mathematics	30	18.00	60.00%	Moderately Ready
Social Studies	30	17.94	59.80%	Moderately Ready
Science	30	13.69	45.65%	Below Average
Overall	330	65.98	65.98%	Moderately Ready

Discussion

There was a clear increase in mean scores across all subjects except Science. Filipino and Mathematics showed the highest improvement, likely because these subjects are structured and benefit significantly from practice and repetition,

as noted by Manalo (2024). Science showed minimal change, possibly due to the short duration of the review, the breadth of scientific concepts, or limited laboratory/visual materials available—findings supported by Cagasan et al. (2023).

Comparison of Pretest and Posttest Scores

Table 3 Test of Significant Difference

Subject Area	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Gain	t-value	p-value	Decision at $\alpha=0.05$
Professional Education	102.82	119.40	+16.58	0.29	0.777	Not Significant
Social Studies	18.76	17.94	-0.82	0.95	0.349	Not Significant
Science	14.52	13.69	-0.83	1.39	0.175	Not Significant
English	10.68	20.25	+9.57	0.15	0.885	Not Significant

Subject Area	Pretest Mean	Posttest Mean	Mean Gain	t-value	p-value	Decision at $\alpha=0.05$
Filipino	8.93	22.30	+13.37	1.72	0.200	Not Significant
Mathematics	9.15	18.00	+8.85	1.72	0.200	Not Significant
Overall	45.90	65.98	+20.08	0.87	0.420	Not Significant

Discussion

While numerical improvement is visible, the paired t-test shows no statistically significant difference. This result is consistent with similar studies by Dela Cruz (2023) and Reyes (2024), who found that short-term review programs (2–4 weeks) can raise scores but often lack the intensity and duration to produce statistically significant gains, especially when baseline competence is low. Reasons for the lack of significance include:

1. Short duration: Two weeks is insufficient to master the entire scope of the LET.
2. Limited prior mastery: Students started at a low baseline, requiring more time to build foundational knowledge.
3. Test difficulty: The pre-board test is designed to be challenging, requiring long-term retention.

Conclusions

Based on the findings, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The in-house review program resulted in modest to moderate improvement in most subject areas, raising the overall readiness from “Below Average” to “Moderately Ready.”
2. Descriptive improvement does not equate to statistical significance; the changes observed were not large enough to be attributed solely to the intervention.
3. Subjects with clear rules and structures (Filipino, Math, English) responded better to review, while Science and Social Studies require more time and resources to improve.

4. The program served its purpose as a diagnostic tool, identifying specific weaknesses and familiarizing students with the exam format.

Practical Recommendations

To improve future review programs and increase LET readiness, the following suggestions are proposed:

1. Extend Review Duration: Increase the program from 2 weeks to 6–8 weeks, with sessions held twice a week during the semester and intensive sessions during the final month before the exam.
2. Differentiate Instruction: Allocate more time and resources to Science, English, and Mathematics, where deficits are greatest. Use visual aids, videos, and simplified textbooks to improve understanding.
3. Implement a Review Curriculum: Develop a standardized TRAC LET Review Guide aligned with the latest PRC Table of Specifications.
4. Continuous Assessment: Administer monthly diagnostic tests throughout the final year to track progress and adjust focus areas.
5. Peer Tutoring: Pair students with stronger skills in specific subjects with those needing help to reinforce learning.
6. Institutionalize the Program: Make the review program a formal requirement or credit-bearing activity, ensuring consistent participation and funding.

Acknowledgements

The researcher would like to thank Tawi-Tawi Regional Agricultural College for their much-

needed support and helpful environment to conduct this study. Also, great thanks are to the pre-service teachers taking part in the Ag. Educ. 402 (Practice Teaching) program, whose

involvement, cooperation, and dedication throughout the assessment period was the main source of data for this research.

References

- Antiojo, L. P. (2017). Performance of education graduates in the Licensure Examination for Teachers (LET). *People International Journal of Social Science*, 3(2), 1363–1384.
- Bloom, B. S. (1968). Learning for mastery. *Evaluation Comment*, 1(2), 1–12.
- Cagasan, E. G., et al. (2023). Challenges and strategies in preparing teacher education students for licensure examinations in BARMM. *Mindanao Journal of Science and Technology*, 22(1), 45–58.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2024). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dela Cruz, M. (2023). Effectiveness of short-term review programs on LET performance: A quasi-experimental study. *Philippine Journal of Teacher Education*, 10(1), 22–30.
- Generalao, I. N., Ducanes, G., Yee, K. M., & David, C. (2022). Teacher education in the Philippines: Are we meeting the demand for quality? *Philippine Journal of Public Policy*, 5(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.54096/IENE4805>
- Guskey, T. R. (2023). *Mastery learning: The legacy of Benjamin Bloom*. Routledge.
- Knowles, M. S., Holton, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (2020). *The adult learner: The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development* (8th ed.). Routledge.
- Manalo, J. (2024). Factors influencing LET performance: A review of recent studies. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 5, Article 100145.
- Professional Regulation Commission. (2016). LET results: March and September 2016. PRC Official Records.
- Professional Regulation Commission. (2024). Licensure Examination for Teachers: Revised table of specifications. PRC Board of Professional Teachers.
- Reyes, A. (2024). Impact of review programs on licensure exam readiness: A meta-analysis. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Studies*, 11(2), 78–92.
- Republic Act No. 7836. (1994). Philippine Teachers Professionalization Act. *Official Gazette of the Philippines*.
- Soriano, R., & Dela Cruz, J. (2023). Academic preparedness and LET readiness of pre-service teachers in regional state colleges. *Philippine Journal of Higher Education*, 20(1), 56–70.
- Ulla, M. B., et al. (2022). Pre-service teacher preparation and LET performance: Evidence from Western Mindanao. *International Journal of Teacher Education and Research*, 7(1), 12–25.