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Abstract - Generally the study aims to analyze the performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination of one private school in the Philippines. Specifically, it aims to describe the University performance in the six professional board subjects; to present the performance in Licensure Examination of the Criminology graduates from 2008 to 2013; to compare the results of licensure examination per subject and to propose plan of action to improve the board performance of the University. The study made use of documentary and archival method in order to obtain the results of the Licensure Examination for the criminology graduates. It was found out that majority of the examiners passed the Criminal Jurisprudence and Procedure for the year 2008, while from 2009 – 2013, majority passed the Crime Detection and Investigation (CDI), majority of the examiners passed the overall licensure examination from 2008 to 2013. There is no significant difference between the performances of each examiner in each subject. A plan of action was proposed to enhance the performance of the criminology graduates in their licensure examination.
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INTRODUCTION

A graduate of Baccalaureate degree in Criminology is required to pass the Licensure Examination from the Professional Regulation Commission of the Philippines to be considered as Licensed Criminologist in order to be given full authority to practice the profession. This is mandated under Republic Act No. 6506 which states that “the law creating the Board of Criminology. Once licensed as a criminologist, it gives the holder
an open door to enter several options of employment in the private and public sector as well as in the international arena. A licensed criminologist is said to be a generalist as he can perform services offered in law enforcement and public safety administration, forensic sciences, security industries, training and education sectors, and other related services”.

Certified criminologists shall be eligible for appointment as Police Officer 1 in chartered cities and municipalities, provided they possess the general qualifications for appointment provided in Section 14 of RA8551.

A Criminologist’s job includes practice in the field of Law Enforcement as an agent, adviser or administrator; as a Technician in dactyloscopy, ballistics and other scientific aspects of crime detection; as an officer in any correctional and penal institution; as a counselor in various agencies such as those involved in criminal research or public welfare; or as a teacher or instructor of Criminology subjects in universities (“BS in Criminology in the Philippines”, n.d.).

Normally, the BS Criminology program takes 4 years to complete. Board Examination is scheduled twice a year in the months of April and October. The main subjects of the board exam include Criminal Jurisprudence; Procedure and Evidence; Law Enforcement Administration; Criminalistics; Crime Detection and Investigation; Sociology of Crimes and Ethics; and Correctional Administration.

Many students after graduation have 5-6 months to review the material before the board exam. Review programs are usually provided by the school. However, some students decide on enrolling at specialized review centers (“BS in Criminology in the Philippines”, n.d.).

The researchers were interested in knowing the status of the Board performance of the College. Because they believed it would help future examinees by providing them the real picture of the board examination results and thereby inform them of the weaknesses, if ever, so that they will be prepared in coping this problem and possibly think of an effective solution. Likewise, the College of Criminology will also benefit from the result of this study as this will serve as basis for improving the quality of instruction, specifically, for professional subjects.
OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Generally, the study aimed to analyze the performance in the Criminology Licensure Examination of the University under study. Specifically, it aims to describe the University performance in the six professional board subjects; to present the performance in Criminology Licensure Examination of the graduates from School Year 2008-2013; to compare the results of licensure examination per subject and lastly, to propose plan of action to enhance board performance.

METHODS

Research Design

Descriptive method of research design was used for this study. Descriptive studies in which the researcher does not interact with the participant include observational studies of people in an environment and studies involving data collection using existing records. Because classes of data are collected and studies conducted to formulate principles that might guide the future action (e.g., medical record review).

Instrument

There is no instrument used for the study. Only the data collected from the scholastic records of the graduates from the University and the result of examination from Professional Regulation Commission. Data collection and analysis were done to come up with needed information.

Data Gathering Procedure

Documentary research is the use of outside sources, documents, to support the viewpoint or argument of an academic work. The process of documentary research often involves some or all of conceptualizing, using and assessing documents (Scott, 2006). This study utilized the records of the Criminology Board Examination Results from year 2008 to 2013.

The researchers, in order to gather their primary data, made a request letter addressed to the Dean of College of Criminology to furnish them with records pertaining to board
examination results from 2008-2013. From the furnished record, the researchers analyzed, tallied and tabulated the data to arrive with their objectives which are to describe and compare the University performance in the six professional board subjects which are Law Enforcement Administration, Criminal Jurisprudence and Procedure, correctional Administration, Criminalistics, Criminal Sociology, CDI. The researcher sought the assistance of their statistician in computing the mean rank and presenting it on the table.

Data Analysis
All data needed was tallied, encoded and interpreted using the objectives of the study. The obtained data were treated using SPSS version 18 to further analyze the result.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
This part includes the results of the data gathered by the researchers from the documents which includes the names and grade of the graduates of criminology who took up the Licensure Examination for the year 2008 – 2013.

Figure 1. Performance in Six Professional Board Subjects for the Year 2008 (N=50)

Figure 1 shows the performance of the graduates in the six professional board subjects for the year 2008. It shows that among 50, who took up the exam, majority passed the subject CLJ, and CDI which got the frequency of 33 and only 17 failed this subject. The Criminal Sociology subject is passed by 32
graduates and 18 failed, Law Enforcement Administration got 31 graduates who passed and 19 are failed. For Criminalistic subject, 30 passed and 20 failed and the least is Correctional Administration subject wherein 29 passed and 31 failed.

It shows that the Criminal and Justice Procedure obtained the highest passers. This is because the subject covers the main objective of the course which is “Criminology” for the study of crimes. The students took this course because they want to learn why crimes are occurring in different places and events and how the behavior of each individual affects the risk of such events.

![Figure 2. Performance in Six Professional Board Subjects for the Year 2009 (N=72)](image)

Figure 2 shows the performance of the graduates in the six professional board subjects for the year 2009. Among 72 graduates, CDI subject got 46 passers and 26 failed, followed by Correctional Administration with 43 passed and 29 failed, Criminalistic got 38 who passed and 34 who failed, Law Enforcement Administration got 36 passers and 36 failed. Lastly the subjects Criminal Justice and Procedure and Criminal Sociology have 34 passers and 38 who failed the subject.

This implies that the graduates passed the CDI followed by the correctional administration. Ethics is a study of behavior which is imposed in the society which is already learned starting at home and through childhood and adulthood. That is why most students never encountered hardship with regards to this subject.

CDI deals with emotional intelligence and how these skills carry over into career success, such as through ethics,
communication, diversity, teamwork, conflict, good decision making, stress management, motivation, and leadership. (www.prc.gov.ph)

Figure 3 shows the performance of the graduates in the six professional board subjects for the year 2010. It shows that the subject Criminalistic obtained the highest passers which got the frequency of 36 while 17 failed the subject. The CDI got 32 passers and 21 failed, Criminal Sociology with 27 passers and 16 who failed, while Criminal Justice and Procedure got 25 passers and 28 who failed. Correctional Administration with 24 passers and 29 failed and the least is Law Enforcement Administration with 21 passers and 32 who failed.

Same with the previous year, most of the graduates were able to pass the ethics subject, however, majority of them also passed the criminalistic subject which one of the most interesting aspects of criminology. In every crime or event that occurs, the criminology graduates or students have become excited in solving a crime problem based on the evidence. This technique was always used in everyday lives that is why this subject is not really hard to pass.

Criminalistics is the scientific study and evaluation of physical evidence in the commission of crimes. It is the science dealing with the detection of crime and the apprehension of
criminals (Rudin & Inman, 2000). Furthermore, while student learning is clearly the goal of education, there is a pressing need to provide evidence that learning or mastery actually occurs. Mastery of tasks involving innovative diagnostic and therapeutic technologies often follows a steep learning curve for both the professional and associate.

![Figure 4. Performance in Six Professional Board Subjects for the Year 2011 (N=89)](image)

Figure 4 shows the performance of the graduates in the six professional board subjects for the year 2011. Among 89 examiners, majority passed CDI subject which got the frequency of 52 while 37 failed the subject followed by Criminal Sociology with 44 who passed and 45 who failed and Criminal Justice and Procedure with 43 who passed and 46 failed. The Criminalistic subject got 40 who passed and 49 who failed while Law Enforcement Administration with 36 passers and 53 who failed and the least is Correctional Administration with 26 who passed and 63 who failed.

Most of examiners also passed the ethics subject but most of them also passed the criminal sociology. There has been development and curriculum program proposed by the faculty members and the whole community of the University to enhance the competitiveness of their students. And since the University is one of the schools that offers criminology program, then they can make sure that they produce competent criminology graduates.

Figure 5 shows the performance of the graduates in the six professional board subjects for the year 2012. It shows that CDI got the highest passers with 39 and 48 graduates who failed followed by Criminalistic subject with 33 passers and 54 who failed and Correctional Administration with 28 who passed and
59 who failed. The Criminal Sociology got 27 who passed and 60 who failed and the least is Criminal Justice and Procedure and Law Enforcement Administration with 26 passers and 61 who failed.

Figure 5. Performance in Six Professional Board Subjects for the Year 2012 (N=87)

During this year, it shows that the examiners passed the ethics and criminalistic subject. But then they also performed good in correctional administration subject. This is a good performance because they must also ensure that the correctional management such as jail management is understood and managed correctly. This does not imply that even people who commit crimes will not be treated equal with people who are not committing crimes.

Figure 6. Performance in Six Professional Board Subjects for the Year 2013 (N=115)
Figure 6 shows the performance of the graduates in the six professional board subjects for the year 2013. CDI got the highest passers which got the frequency of 77 while 38 failed the subject followed by Criminalistic and Correctional Administration with 70 passers and 45 who failed, Law Enforcement Administration with 65 passers and 50 who failed, Criminal Sociology with 63 passed and 52 failed and the least is Criminal Justice and Procedure with 60 passers and 55 who failed.

It implies that students also passed the ethics subject, the criminalistic and correctional administration which is same with the previous years. However, this also shows that the examiners were also good in Law Enforcement Administration. This subject is focused with the organizational management and how to deal with the problems within an institution.

Working effectively as part of a team is incredibly important for output quality, morale, and retention. Professional experience involving teamwork has primarily been within process and software engineering, but most of the takeaway lessons aren’t limited to engineering. The problem with this logic — and the reason it’s a myth — is that each additional engineer added to a project incurs both communication and coordination overhead with everyone else on the team, and so the time to complete a project doesn’t actually decrease linearly with increased staffing. Because of this line of reasoning, managers or technical leads sometimes over-correct and attempt to maximize efficiency by staffing single-person projects to reduce the communication overhead down to zero (Lau, 2013).

On-the-Job Training is one of the mechanics of Higher Education industries in developing the needed professional competencies of its graduates (Martinez et al., 2014). Its goals and objectives served as a guide in developing the needed competencies for a particular job, and translating the training into a gainful working experience (Ylagan, 2013).

Figure 7 shows the comparison of the performance in criminology licensure examination of the graduates for the year 2008 – 2013. It shows that in year 2008, there are 29 graduates who passed the licensure examination while 21 who are considered failed which comes up with a total of 50 examiners.
Figure 7. Comparison of the Overall Performance in Criminology Licensure Examination of the Graduates for the Year 2008 - 2013

While in year 2009, from a total of 72 criminology graduates of the University under study who took the licensure examination, there are 35 who officially passed and 37 who failed. In 2010, there are 27 graduates who passed the licensure examination while 26 failed which comes up with a total of 53 examiners. For the year 2011, the number of passers is 35 while the number of students who failed the licensure examination is 56. The total graduates who took the licensure examination are 91 criminology graduates for this year.

With regards to the year 2012, with 87 criminology graduates, only 22 passed the examination and 65 graduates who failed. According to the data of year 2013, there are 63 criminology graduates who officially passed the examination while only 52 failed the examination with a total of 115 criminology graduates.

In a total computation, that majority passed the licensure examination compared to those who failed the exam. This is because many students are ready to become professionals and become good to their chosen profession.

The competitiveness and the career progression paths are mastered by students and being successful is part of their competence as professionals of their chosen paths. Students are active participants in their learning experiences and must take responsibility for achieving their potentials through successful completion of each stage of their studies (Laguador & Pesigan,
2013). Few things affect a student’s performance as much as the development of productive study skills. Study skills encourage areas such as work attitudes, time management, homework strategies and test-taking skills (Laguador, 2013). Adapting Outcomes-based curriculum provides periodic monitoring of academic performance and behavior as well as the result of study habits of the students (Laguador & Dizon, 2013).

Table 1. Statistical Comparison on the Board Performance Per Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) subject</th>
<th>(J) subject</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>-1.417</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>-2.917</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>-0.333</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>-1.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>-0.583</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>-0.917</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>CLJ</td>
<td>-1.667</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA</td>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>-3.083</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDI</td>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>-4.583</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminalistic</td>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>-3.667</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Crime Socio</td>
<td>-2.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: Significant at p-value < 0.05

Statistical comparisons between the subjects were carried out using One Way Analysis of Variance. The difference between groups for pair wise comparison was assessed using Scheffe.
There is no significant difference in the performance of students on the different subjects, $F$-value $=0.150$, $df =5,60$, $0.979 > 0.05$. Statistical result showed that the board performance on each subject is just the same compared to all taken subjects.

This is because the performance of the student varies depending on their behavior and exposure in their training. The students also are exposed to different law enforcement work so that they will be able to understand the environment of their profession. Laguador (2015) emphasized that learning can be obtained through various means and experiences as long as people would be able to gain appropriate information, skills and attitude.

Moreover, training is a significant tool for student development. Training has assumed great importance because of the exceptional rate of change in the internal and external organizational environment. Trained personnel produce quality and quantity output; enable the organization to face competition from rival firms; can respond and adapt to the changing technology well and; and become more proficient (Juneja, 2008).

**Plan of Action**

Table 2 presents the proposed plan of action to enhance the board exam performance of the University in C-BLE.

**Table 2. Plan of Action**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Area</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>To enhance the performance of the criminology graduates in their licensure examination</td>
<td>Reinforcement Review every semester based on what Major subject was taken by the students</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladderization</td>
<td>To enhance the career progress for criminology students</td>
<td>Ladderized program for the criminology program</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSIONS**
Majority of the examiners passed the CIJ for the year 2008, while from 2009 – 2013, majority passed the Crime Detection and Investigation (CDI). There is a fluctuating trend in the overall performance of BS Criminology graduates in the licensure examination from SY 2008-2013. There is no significant difference between the performance of each examiner in each subject. A plan of action was proposed to enhance the performance of the criminology graduates in their licensure examination

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that seminar about criminology licensure examination must be done by the college of criminology in order to thoroughly briefed the students about the licensure examination. A seminar about examination techniques must be done for the criminology students to enhance their performance. A future study was recommended using other factors such as factors affecting their performance, learning styles and major subjects general average. A plan of action was proposed to enhance the performance of criminology graduates of the University.
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