Comparative Analysis on the Board and Academic Performances of BS Criminology Graduates

Maita LP. Guadamor

Abstract--- The College of Criminal Justice Education of Cagayan State University Piat Campus offering the Criminology Program is mandated to comply with the requirements. The licensure examination results speak of the preparedness of students in taking the examination, the quality of instruction by the faculty and the exposure of the students to practical learning experiences through the equipment and apparatuses provided by the administration. The conduct of this research aimed to make a comparative analysis on the board and academic performances of BS Criminology graduates of 2016 and 2017, CSU Piat, Cagayan. This study used the descriptive normative survey method utilizing documentary analysis as a technique in gathering the required data. Reference.com defines that descriptive-normative survey combines two research methods which involve the gathering of information to describe the object of study as it is, has been or is viewed, which is the descriptive method, and the critiquing of the object to identify ways to improve it, the normative method. The respondents were the graduates from the College of Criminal Justice Education at Cagayan State University Piat Campus in the school years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. Total enumeration was employed in selecting the 49 respondents who took the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) administered by the Professional Regulation Commission. From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the general weighted average of graduates in the six subject areas are correlated with the results of the board examination as well as the identified factors attributed to the passing or failing in the board examination and that the researcher strongly recommends that the Faculty members should regularly update their knowledge and competencies along with the subject areas being handled to contribute to the increase passing rate, enforce a stringent screening and retention policies for criminology students as regards grade point average and curriculum enrichment and periodic review of the course contents, in consultation with the subject-experts, should be done.

Keywords--- Comparative Analysis, Board Exam, Academic Performance, Republic Act 6506, CMO #21, Academic Competencies.

I. INTRODUCTION

Republic Act 6506 was enacted creating the Board of Criminology tasked to administer the Licensure Examination for all BS Criminology graduates. Takers are required to comply with the requirements as set in the Commission on Higher Education Memorandum Order #21, series of 2005.

The College of Criminal Justice Education of Cagayan State University Piat Campus offering the Criminology Program is mandated to comply with the requirements. The licensure examination results speak of the preparedness of students in taking the examination, the quality of instruction by the faculty and the exposure of the students to practical learning experiences through the equipment and apparatuses provided by the administration.

Maita LP. Guadamor, Dean, College of Criminal Justice Education, Cagayan State University, Piat Campus, Cagayan, Philippines.
E-mail: maitapajarillo@yahoo.com

The average point grade of the graduates in the six fields of examination will be taken into consideration to assess their preparedness in taking the licensure examination. In the same manner, the result of their board examination in the six fields will be accounted for comparison, giving room for improvement not only on the part of students but also for the administration and faculty members who are directly in contact with students.

Objectives

The conduct of this research aimed to make a comparative analysis on the board and academic performances of BS Criminology graduates of 2016 and 2017, CSU Piat, Cagayan.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the average grade of the BS Criminology takers in the different fields of the Criminologist Licensure Examination along:

    1.1   Criminal Law and Jurisprudence

    1.2   Law Enforcement Administration

    1.3   Criminalistics

    1.4   Crime Detection and Investigation

    1.5   Criminal Sociology

    1.6   Correctional Administration

2. What is the average point grade of the BS Criminology graduates in their academics along:

    2.1   Criminal Law and Jurisprudence

    2.2   Law Enforcement Administration

    2.3   Criminalistics

    2.4   Crime Detection and Investigation

    2.5   Criminal Sociology

    2.6   Correctional Administration

3. Is there a significant relationship on the board and academic performance of the BS Criminology takers on the six fields of the Criminologists Licensure Examination?

II. METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive normative survey method utilizing documentary analysis as a technique in gathering the required data. Reference.com **defines that descriptive-normative survey combines two research methods which involve the gathering of information to describe the object of study as it is, has been or is viewed, which is the descriptive method, and the critiquing of the object to identify ways to improve it, the normative method.**

The respondents were the graduates from the College of Criminal Justice Education at Cagayan State University Piat Campus in the school years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. Total enumeration was employed in selecting the 49 respondents who took the Criminologist Licensure Examination (CLE) administered by the Professional Regulation Commission.

Table 1: Distribution of the Respondents of the Study

School Year	Number of Graduates	Number of CLE Takers
2015-2016	22	19
2016-2017	39	30
Total	61	49

The researcher used the board results officially acquired from the PRC and the general weighted average from the Campus Registrar's Office. These were tabulated, compared and analysed using the following statistical treatments: simple frequency count, Mean, Standard deviation and Pearson Product moment of correlation.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' GWA in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence

GWA in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
76-80	-	-	4	13.33
81-85	9	47.37	24	80.00
86-90	10	52.63	2	6.67
Total	19	100	30	100

Table 2 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' General Weighted Average (GWA) in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence. As presented in the table, more than half of the respondents in 2016 (10 or 52.63 percent) have grades ranging from 86 to 90 while all the rest (9 or 47.37 percent) have grades ranging from 81 to 85. In 2017, 80 percent or 24 respondents have grades from 81 to 85. Moreover, 2 or 6.67 percent of them have grades of 86 to 90 and 4 or 13.33 have the lowest grade of 76 to 80. The data imply that respondents obtained passing grades in their subject – Criminal Law and Jurisprudence in 2016 and 2017.

Table 3: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' GWA in Law Enforcement Administration

GWA in Law Enforcement Administration	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
76-80	-	-	1	3.33
81-85	4	21.05	11	36.67
86-90	15	78.95	18	60.00
Total	19	100	30	100

Shown in Table 3 is the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' GWA in Law Enforcement Administration. As presented, most of the respondents obtained a general weighted average ranging from 86-90, specifically 15 or 78.95 percent in 2016 and 18 or 60 percent in 2017. The lowest general weighted average garnered by the respondents in 2016 is from 81 to 85 while in 2017 is from 76 to 80.

It can be inferred that the respondents in both years generally performed well in Law Enforcement Administration.

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' GWA in Criminalistics

GWA in Criminalistics	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
81-85	11	57.89	16	53.33
86-90	8	42.11	14	46.67
Total	19	100	30	100

As revealed in Table 4, the highest grades obtained by 8 respondents in 2016 was from 86 to 90 with most of

them (11 or 57.89 percent) garnering a general weighted average ranging from 81-85. In 2017, the highest obtained by 14 respondents was from 86-90 with most of them (16 or 53.33 percent) with general weighted average ranging from 81-85. Generally, respondents passed the subject.

Table 5: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' GWA in Crime Detection and Investigation

GWA in Crime Detection and Investigation	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
81-85	1	5.26	14	46.67
86-90	18	94.74	15	50.00
91-95	-	-	1	3.33
Total	19	100	30	100

Shown in Table 5 is the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' GWA in Crime Detection and Investigation. As gleaned on the table, majority of the respondents in 2016 have grades ranging from 86 to 90 numbering to 18 or 94.74 percent. Only one or 5.26 percent got a grade ranging from 81 to 85. Also, most of the respondents in 2017 have grades from 86 to 90 with 15 or 50 percent. The lowest grades garnered by the respondents in both years range from 81 to 85.

The findings imply that majority of the respondents garnered high grades in the subject.

Table 6: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' GWA in Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations

GWA in Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
81-85	11	57.89	17	56.67
86-90	8	42.11	13	43.33
Total	19	100	30	100

Table 6 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' GWA in Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations in 2017 and 2018. As gleaned from the table, the highest frequency of 11 in 2016 and 17 in 2017 obtained a general weighted average ranging from 81-85. However, the highest grade which ranged from 86-90 was obtained by 8 respondents in 2016 and by 13 respondents in 2017. On the whole, the respondents got passing grades in the subject

Table 7: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' GWA in Correctional Administration

GWA in Correctional Administration	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
81-85	3	15.79	4	13.33
86-90	13	68.42	22	73.33
91-95	3	15.79	4	13.33
Total	19	100	30	100

The frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' GWA in Correctional Administration is presented in Table 7. As shown in the table, only 3 of the 19 respondents in 2016 got a general weighted average of 91 to 95 while only 4 out of the 30 respondnets in 2017 got the same range of general weighted average in the same subject.

In both years, majority of the respondents obtained a general weighted average ranging from 86 to 90.

It can be inferred from data that respondents find the subject easy considering a greater proportion of the total respondents with high general weighted average.

Table 8: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence in the CLE

Rating in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
56-60	-	-	2	6.67
61-65	-	-	-	
66-70	-	-	1	3.33
71-75	4	21.05	3	10.00
76-80	10	52.63	16	53.33
81-85	5	26.32	8	26.67
Total	19	100	30	100

Table 8 shows the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' rating in Criminal Law and Jurisprudence in the Criminologists Licensure Examination for 2016 and 2017. As shown in the table, most of the examinees in 2016 numbering to 10 or 52.63 percent and 16 or 53.33 in 2017 got grades ranging from 76 to 80. The lowest grade in 2016 garnered by 4 or 21.05 percent range from 71 to 75 while in 2017, the lowest grades were from 56 to 60. The findings would imply that the examinees had a difficulty passing this subject especially in 2017.

Table 9: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Law Enforcement Administration in the CLE

Rating in Law Enforcement Administration	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
71-75	2	10.53	3	10.00
76-80	9	47.37	11	36.67
81-85	8	42.11	13	43.33
86-90	-	-	3	10.00
Total	19		30	

Presented in Table 9 is the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' rating in Law Enforcement Administration in the Criminologists Licensure Examination. As the table reveals, most of the examinees in 2016 (9 or 47.37 percent) have ratings which range from 76 to 80. On the other hand, most examinees in 2017 including 13 or 43.33 percent of their total number have grades ranging from 81 to 85. Among those who took the exam in 2017, three or 10 percent have scores ranging from 86 to 90. The findings imply that the examinees have a good preparation in this subject because only few of them failed.

Table 10: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminalistics in the CLE

Rating in Criminalistics	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
56-60	-	-	1	3.33
61-65	-	-	3	10.00
66-70	-	-	2	6.67
71-75	4	21.05	6	20.00
76-80	11	57.89	14	46.67
81-85	3	15.79	4	13.33
86-90	1	5.26	-	-
Total	19	100	30	100

Shown in Table 10 is the frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' rating in Criminalistics. In both years, majority of the examinees have grades ranging from 76 to 80, specifically 11 or 57.89 percent in 2016 and 14 or 46.67 percent in 2017. The lowest grade in 2017 is 56 to 60 while in 2016 is 71 to 75. This means that the examinees in 2016 performed better than the 2017 examinees. A considerably high number of examinees failed in this subject area.

Table 11: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Crime Detection and Investigation in the CLE

Rating in Crime Detection and Investigation	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
71-75	3	15.79	3	10.00
76-80	6	31.58	6	20.00
81-85	7	36.84	14	46.67
86-90	3	15.79	7	23.33
Total	19	100	30	100

The frequency and percentage distribution of the respondents' rating in Crime Detection and Investigation in the Criminologists Licensure Examination shows that a considerably high number of examinees passed this subject area. Majority of the examinees, particularly 7 or 36.84 percent in 2016 and 14 or 46.67 percent in 2017, have scores ranging from 81 to 85. The highest range of grades garnered in both years is from 86 to 90 by 3 or 15. 79 percent in 2016 and 7 or 23.33 percent in 2017.

In this subject area, the examinees in both years have good preparation as reflected in their passing ratings.

Table 12: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations in the CLE

Rating in Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
61-65	-	-	1	3.33
66-70	-	-	1	3.33
71-75	2	10.53	7	23.33
76-80	6	31.58	16	53.33
81-85	7	36.84	5	16.67
86-90	4	21.05	-	-
Total	19	100	30	100

Table 12 presents the frequency and percentage distribution of respondents' rating in Criminal Sociology, Ethics and Human Relations rating in the Criminologists Licensure Examination. Data show that most of the examinees in 2016 (7 or 36.84 percent) have ratings ranging from 81 to 85 while most of the 2017 examinees (16 or 53.33 percent) have ratings ranging from 76 to 80.

The highest rating obtained in this area is from 86 to 90 in 2016 and 81 to 85 in 2017. There were more examinees in 2017 who have ratings below 75 compared to examinees in 2016. The data imply that this subject area was more difficult to pass in 2017 if not the examinees were not well-prepared for it.

Table 13: Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Respondents' Rating in Correctional Administration in the CLE

Rating in Correctional Administration	2016		2017	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
51-55	-	-	1	3.33
56-60	-	-	2	6.67
61-65	-	-	-	-
66-70	-	-	1	3.33
71-75	2	10.53	5	16.67
76-80	16	84.21	17	56.67
81-85	1	5.26	4	13.33
Total	19	100	30	100

In Correctional Administration in the CLE, the highest rating obtained in both years range from 76 to 80 by 16 or 84.21 percent in 2016 and by 17 or 56.67 percent in 2017. The lowest range of grades in 2016 is from 71 to 75 while in 2017 is from 51 to 55.

The data imply that respondents barely pass this area because the ratings are just a bit higher than the CLE passing rate of 75.

Table 14: Relationship between the Respondents' Academic Performance and Ratings in the Criminologists Licensure Examination 2017

	GWA
CLE RATING	0.189

± 1.740 critical value .05

The relationship between the respondents' academic performance and ratings in the Criminologists Licensure Examination 2016 is presented in Table 14. The Correlation Coefficient value of .189 reflects that the general weighted average in the six subject areas are significantly correlated with the CLE rating.

This finding would imply that if the general weighted average of the respondents is low, the CLE rating would likewise be low vis a vis the higher the GWA, the higher the CLE ratings.

Table 15: Relationship between the Respondents' Academic Performance and Ratings in the Criminologists Licensure Examination 2018

	CLE RATING
GWA	.196

± 1.701 critical value .05

The relationship between the respondents' academic performance and ratings in the Criminologists Licensure Examination 2017 is presented in Table 15. Correlation coefficient value of .196 reflects that the general weighted average in the six subject areas are significantly correlated with the CLE rating.

This finding would imply that if the general weighted average of the respondents is low, the CLE rating would likewise be low vis a vis the higher the GWA, the higher the CLE ratings.

Hence, the hypothesis which states that "There is no relationship between the academic performance and the CLE ratings" is rejected.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that the general weighted average of graduates in the six subject areas are correlated with the results of the board examination as well as the identified factors attributed to the passing or failing in the board examination.

Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing findings, the researcher has the following recommendations to offer:

1. Faculty members should regularly update their knowledge and competencies along with the subject areas being handled to contribute to the increase passing rate.

2. Stringent screening and retention policies for criminology students as regards grade point average should be implemented.

3. Curriculum enrichment and periodic review of the course contents, in consultation with the subject-experts, should be done.

4. The school should provide faculty development fund to help in addressing the immediate needs of the department, particularly in sending faculty members to training and seminars for updating and upgrading.

5. In-house review should be considered to help graduates pass the board examination.

REFERENCES

[1]   PRC [Internet]. c2011~2015. Mandate; [cited 2015 March 29]. Available fromhttps://goo.gl/mSPwyq
[2]   RA 1080 -Provided under Item No. 5, Part V of the Revised Policies on Qualification Standards.
[3]   Republic Act No. 11131, or the Philippine Criminology Profession Act of 2018.
[4]   RA 6506 an Act Creating the Board of Examiners for Criminologists in the Philippines and for Other Purposes.
[5]   CMO 21, series of 2005