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**ABSTRACT**

|  |
| --- |
| This study examined employer feedback on the performance of BEED graduates from Davao Oriental State University – Cateel Campus, using Human Capital Theory as its framework. Surveying 37 school-based supervisors, it assessed graduate competencies in nine key areas. Results showed very satisfactory performance (x̄ = 4.44), with highest ratings in collaboration and leadership. No significant differences were found across demographic groups, indicating consistent performance. The findings affirm the BEED program’s effectiveness and suggest enhancing training in assessment, differentiated instruction, and collaboration. |
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

Teacher performance significantly affects student outcomes and national development (Hattie, 2018). However, various challenges—such as limited professional development, inadequate resources, and weak support systems—continue to hinder teacher effectiveness (Hennessy et al., 2022). Globally and locally, reforms remain complex and difficult to sustain (Manfra, 2019).

In countries like Indonesia and many developing nations, poor instruction is often linked to insufficient training, low qualifications, and lack of classroom management (Nurhadi et al., 2017; Berry, 2020). These are worsened by the absence of continuous development and effective evaluation.

In the Philippines, teacher performance remains a key concern, especially in rural areas. Despite efforts like the K-12 reform and the Philippine Professional Standards for Teachers (PPST), issues such as heavy workloads, limited training access, and resource shortages persist (Abay & Morallo, 2019; Hester et al., 2020). Disparities in teacher quality continue to widen educational gaps, highlighting the need for targeted interventions (Kaiser & König, 2019; Okeke & Mtyuda, 2017).

One strategy for improvement is employer feedback, particularly on BEED graduates. Employers can offer insights into real-world teaching demands and help refine teacher education programs (Okolie et al., 2019; Baird & Parayitam, 2019). However, most existing studies focus on national data, with limited research in local contexts like Davao Oriental (Brown et al., 2019; Aguirre et al., 2020).

This study addresses that gap by examining local employer feedback on the competencies of BEED graduates in Davao Oriental. Findings aim to guide educational institutions and policymakers in enhancing teacher preparation and performance based on actual workplace needs.

**2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This study is grounded in Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964), which views education and training as investments that enhance individuals’ productivity. BEED graduates, as human capital, reflect the quality of teacher preparation through their job performance, assessed via employer feedback.

Core competencies such as subject knowledge, classroom management, assessment skills, adaptability, dependability, communication, and leadership are essential indicators of teacher effectiveness. These competencies not only improve classroom outcomes but also contribute to national development by producing capable and ethical educators, aligning with the broader goals of Human Capital Theory.

**3. OBJECTIVES**

This study aimed to determine the feedback and satisfaction of employers with the performance of BEED graduates from Davao Oriental State University (DORSU) – Cateel Campus. Specifically, this sought to attain the following objectives:

1. To determine the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of;
   1. age;
   2. gender;
   3. position;
   4. years in service and
   5. district.
2. To determine the employers’ feedback on the performance of BEED graduates in the workplace in terms of:
3. subject knowledge;
4. management of learning;
5. assessment and evaluation;
6. flexibility and adaptability;
7. dependability;
8. communication skills;
9. leadership skills;
10. commitment; and
11. collaboration.
12. To determine the significant difference in the level of employer feedback/satisfaction when grouped according to:
    1. age;
    2. gender;
    3. position;
    4. years in service and district.

**4. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Research Design**

This study used a descriptive research design to systematically gather and analyze employer feedback on BEED graduates’ performance. As a non-experimental method, it aimed to understand workplace perceptions without exploring causal relationships, guiding curriculum and policy improvements.

**Research Instrument**

This study used a reliable (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.72) survey adapted from Salendab et al. (2023), consisting of two parts: demographic data and employer feedback on BEED graduates across key competencies. Each domain—such as Subject Knowledge, Classroom Management, Assessment, Flexibility, Dependability, Communication, Leadership, Commitment, and Collaboration—had five statements. The survey was administered face-to-face.

**Respondents of the Study**

The respondents in this study were 37 immediate supervisors from public and private basic education, selected through a complete enumeration technique. These respondents were from schools within District 1 of Davao Oriental, specifically in the municipalities of Boston, Cateel, and Baganga, that employ BEED graduates from the Davao Oriental State University Cateel Campus with at least one year of experience working with them.

**Data Gathering**

The researchers followed the following procedures in conducting the research:

1. **Obtaining Research Ethics Clearance:** The researcher obtained ethical clearance from the University Research Ethics Board (UREB) prior to commencing the study. They submitted the full research proposal, observation checklist, informed consent forms, curriculum vitae, and a list of potential risks and mitigation strategies for approval.
2. **Identifying Number of Respondents:** A letter was submitted to the Public Schools District Supervisor (PSDS) requesting assistance in identifying BEED graduates employed in the district. Following this, the researchers visited the respective schools where these graduates were assigned in order to identify and reach out to their immediate supervisors.
3. **Requesting Permission:** A letter was sent to each district requesting permission to survey their area. Once the letter was received and the district expressed willingness to participate, the survey was initiated.
4. **Distributing Survey Questionnaire and Informed Consent Form:** Permission was requested from each respondent to participate in the research. An overview of the study was provided, along with an informed consent form, to ensure that respondents understood that their participation was voluntary. The questionnaire was distributed and collected either at school or at the respondent's home, depending on what was most convenient for them, particularly for those assigned to far-flung areas.

**5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter presents results and discussion based on the study’s specific problems. Thirty-seven supervisors from public and private schools in District 1, Davao Oriental, participated through complete enumeration. Ethical protocols were followed, with approved consent and coordination from district supervisors. Questionnaires adapted from Salendab et al. (2023) were distributed with consent forms to accessible locations.

**Profile of the Respondents**

Table 1 presents the age profile of the respondents. A substantial portion of the respondents (67.57%) falls within the 41 to 60 age bracket, indicating that the majority of feedback was derived from older educators

with considerable professional experience. Only 10.81% of the respondents belonged to the age groups 34 years old and below, 35 to 40 years old, and 61 years old and above.

Table 1.Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Age Bracket | Frequency | Percent |
| 34 years old and below | 4 | 10.81 |
| 35 to 40 years old | 4 | 10.81 |
| 41 to 60 years old | 25 | 67.57 |
| 61 years old and above | 4 | 10.81 |
| Total | 37 | 100.00 |

This finding supports studies (Myung et al., 2016; McCray et al., 2017; Béteille et al., 2019) showing that educators aged 41–60 often hold leadership roles due to experience and competence. Table 2 also shows that 59.46% of respondents are female, reflecting the gender trend in the teaching profession.

Table 2. Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of gender

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
| Female | 22 | 59.46 |
| Male | 15 | 40.54 |
| Total | 37 | 100.00 |

This reflects national trends where women dominate the teaching profession, especially in basic education (PCW, 2022). Studies by Fox et al. (2015) and Ahmad et al. (2020) also highlight the rise of female leadership, reinforcing the strong presence of women in both instructional and leadership roles.

Table 3 shows that the respondents included school principals (37.84%), head teachers (32.43%), and school heads or officers-in-charge (29.73%). This distribution confirms that the feedback came from individuals in supervisory and leadership positions, thus lending credibility to the performance evaluations, as they are directly involved in assessing and guiding teacher performance within their institutions.

Table 3- Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of Position

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Position | Frequency | Percent |
| School In-charge/Head | 11 | 29.73 |
| Head Teacher | 12 | 32.43 |
| School Principal | 14 | 37.84 |
| Total | 37 | 100.00 |

Principals are consistently identified as the main source of employer feedback, as they directly observe and assess newly hired teachers. Aquino et al. (2015) and Oboza (2017) emphasized that most tracer studies rely on principals for performance evaluations due to their authoritative insight. Likewise, Ulanday (2021) confirmed their central role in evaluating teacher performance, particularly in public elementary schools.

Table 4 shows that 59.46% of respondents have 16 or more years of service, indicating extensive experience that strengthens the credibility of their evaluations.

Table 4. Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of years in service

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Years in Service | Frequency | Percent |
| 1 to 5 years | 4 | 10.81 |
| 6 to 10 years | 3 | 8.11 |
| 11 to 15 years | 8 | 21.62 |
| 16 years and above | 22 | 59.46 |
| Total | 37 | 100.00 |

he respondents’ long service enhances data reliability, as experience improves evaluation accuracy. Studies by Bayocot & Dagdag (2016) and Padios (2021) support that seasoned supervisors (16+ years) are well-suited to assess graduate competencies.

Table 5 shows that 48.65% of respondents were from Cateel 2, with the rest from Cateel 1 (21.62%), Boston (21.62%), and Baganga North and South (8.11%). This reflects a broad district representation, supporting the study's validity.

Table 5.Demographic profile of the respondents in terms of district

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| School District | Frequency | Percent |
| Baganga North and South District | 3 | 8.11 |
| Cateel 2 District | 18 | 48.65 |
| Cateel 1 District | 8 | 21.62 |
| Boston District | 8 | 21.62 |
| Total | 37 | 100.00 |

Including respondents from multiple districts ensures a more representative and meaningful assessment. As noted by Batucan (2024), Camara (2024), and Orleans (2007), local context and school location influence performance evaluations and support fair, holistic insights.

**Level of Employer Feedback on BEED Graduates**

Table 6 shows the overall performance of BEED graduates, as evaluated by their employers. The graduates' overall performance is very satisfactory (x̄ = 4.44, s = 0.35). This overall rating indicates a strong and consistent level of competency across a broad range of teaching domains.

Table 6.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Factors | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Subject Knowledge | 4.45 | 0.35 | Very Satisfactory |
| Management of Learning | 4.46 | 0.42 | Very Satisfactory |
| Assessment and Evaluation | 4.46 | 0.36 | Very Satisfactory |
| Flexibility and Adaptability | 4.36 | 0.36 | Very Satisfactory |
| Dependability | 4.45 | 0.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| Communication Skills | 4.44 | 0.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| Leadership Skills | 4.47 | 0.39 | Very Satisfactory |
| Commitment | 4.41 | 0.44 | Very Satisfactory |
| Collaboration | 4.50 | 0.44 | Outstanding |
| Overall Performance | 4.44 | 0.35 | Very Satisfactory |

Collaboration received the highest mean rating (x̄ = 4.50), marking it as the only outstanding domain, while Flexibility and Adaptability had the lowest (x̄ = 4.36), indicating room for growth in managing classroom changes. Overall, high scores across domains affirm the BEED program’s effectiveness. Supporting studies (Salendab & Ocariza-Salendab, 2023; Batisla-ong, 2022; Sinsay-Villanueva et al., 2025; Khoo et al., 2020; Favoretto et al., 2019) confirm strong graduate performance in teaching and leadership, aligning with global employer expectations.

**Level of Employer Feedback on BEED Graduates**

Table 7 presents the evaluation of BEED graduates in the Subject Knowledge domain, yielding a mean of 4.45 (SD = 0.35), which is interpreted as very satisfactory. This indicates that graduates possess a strong grasp of the content they are expected to teach, as well as the ability to apply this knowledge effectively in classroom settings.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 7.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance in terms of subject knowledge domain | | | |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Demonstrates a solid understanding of the key concepts, facts, and skills taught at the elementary level. | 4.51 | 0.38 | Outstanding |
| Discusses the topic without relying exclusively on the required reading. | 4.31 | 0.44 | Very Satisfactory |
| Integrates subject matter with students' practical contexts and learning objectives/goals. | 4.52 | 0.37 | Outstanding |
| Shows expertise in using educational technology in the classroom. | 4.48 | 0.44 | Very Satisfactory |
| Explain the relevance of current topics to prior lessons and relate the topic to pertinent current issues or daily activities. | 4.46 | 0.39 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.45 | 0.35 | Very Satisfactory |

BEED graduates scored highest in integrating subject matter with students’ goals (x̄ = 4.52) and demonstrating strong content knowledge (x̄ = 4.51), reflecting excellence in contextualized instruction. The lowest score was in using varied sources beyond required readings (x̄ = 4.31), highlighting a need for broader resource use. These results align with studies (Estacio & Cabrera, 2018; Rodriguez & Cuesta, 2022; Malahay, 2021; Espiritu, 2021; Rubio & Saenz, 2023) affirming strong content mastery and planning.

In Learning Management, the overall mean was 4.46. Encouraging curiosity scored highest (x̄ = 4.53), while facilitating constructive dialogue scored lowest (x̄ = 4.38), suggesting room for growth in inclusive interactions. These findings echo prior research confirming BEED graduates’ competence in managing learning environments.

Table 8.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates' workplace performance in the management of the learning domain

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Facilitates opportunities for students to engage in class activities through active, intensive, or extensive participation. | 4.47 | 0.53 | Very Satisfactory |
| Undertakes several responsibilities within the educational context, including that of a teacher, resource person, coach, adviser, and referee. | 4.47 | 0.41 | Very Satisfactory |
| Develop and execute educational environments and opportunities that facilitate constructive dialogue or interactions. | 4.38 | 0.46 | Very Satisfactory |
| Structure or restructure the learning and teaching context to facilitate the achievement of collective learning goals. | 4.44 | 0.49 | Very Satisfactory |
| Encourages students' curiosity and desire to learn more about the topic. | 4.53 | 0.43 | Outstanding |
| Average | 4.46 | 0.42 | Very Satisfactory |

Gepila Jr. (2020) emphasized that adherence to PPST Domains 2 and 4 enhances teachers’ capacity to manage inclusive classrooms—affirming the BEED program’s effectiveness.

As shown in Table 9, Assessment and Evaluation scored a mean of 4.46 (s = 0.36), with top indicators being alignment of assessments with objectives and timely evaluation (both x̄ = 4.49). The lowest, yet still strong, was the use of performance-based assessments (x̄ = 4.40, s = 0.46), suggesting room for growth in authentic assessment practices. These results confirm BEED graduates’ strong outcome-based and reflective teaching skills.

Table 9.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance in the assessment and evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Design assessment strategies that align with the lesson objectives or learning goals. | 4.49 | 0.38 | Very Satisfactory |
| Assess the lesson to determine the desired outcome within the allotted time. | 4.49 | 0.41 | Very Satisfactory |
| Employs performance-based assessment and criteria or rubrics to measure students’ performance authentically. | 4.40 | 0.46 | Very Satisfactory |
| Compiles learners' output with a summary of results. | 4.44 | 0.39 | Very Satisfactory |
| Communicate promptly and clearly to the learners as to the result of the assessment and evaluation | 4.47 | 0.44 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.46 | 0.36 | Very Satisfactory |

Pacpaco et al. (2022) found that BEED graduates excelled in PPST Domain 5, especially in aligning assessments with learning goals. Gepila Jr. (2020) noted effective use of formative and summative tools, while Sinsay-Villanueva et al. (2025) stressed the role of assessment literacy in top-performing institutions.

Table 10 shows Flexibility and Adaptability had a mean of 4.36 (s = 0.36), with “Demonstrates exceptional flexibility” rated highest (x̄ = 4.44) and “Thrives in ambiguous situations” lowest (x̄ = 4.28), indicating a need for greater confidence in complex settings.

These align with Panlaqui et al. (2022), Pardo and Relon (2023), Domine (2025), and Abana et al. (2021), who highlighted flexibility as vital to teacher success, especially in digital and blended learning contexts.

Table 10.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance in the flexibility and adaptability

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Demonstrates exceptional flexibility by easily adjusting to changing priorities and deadlines. | 4.44 | 0.45 | Very Satisfactory |
| Displays high adaptability by quickly learning and mastering new technologies, tools, and processes. | 4.40 | 0.39 | Very Satisfactory |
| Exhibits flexibility in collaborating with diverse teams, effectively adjusting communication and work styles to accommodate different perspectives and personalities. | 4.38 | 0.43 | Very Satisfactory |
| Thrives in ambiguous situations, displaying adaptability by embracing uncertainty and finding innovative solutions to complex problems. | 4.28 | 0.38 | Very Satisfactory |
| Shows flexibility in balancing multiple projects simultaneously, efficiently reallocating resources, and adapting strategies to meet evolving needs | 4.31 | 0.41 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.36 | 0.36 | Very Satisfactory |

Andres, De la Cruz, and Gonzaga (2021) emphasized adaptability as a key trait of Filipino teachers across modalities.

Table 11 shows Dependability had a very satisfactory mean (x̄ = 4.45, s = 0.40). “Inspires trust and confidence” was highest (x̄ = 4.53), while “Understands the importance of punctuality” was lowest (x̄ = 4.38).

Overall, BEED graduates are viewed as reliable, accountable, and professional, meeting expectations in trust and responsibility.

Table 11.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance in the Dependability

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Ensures that tasks and responsibilities are completed consistently and on time. | 4.42 | 0.47 | Very Satisfactory |
| Follows through on commitment and delivering high-quality work, even when faced with challenges or obstacles. | 4.46 | 0.45 | Very Satisfactory |
| Inspires trust and confidence among colleagues, superiors, and students. | 4.53 | 0.42 | Outstanding |
| Proactively works, takes initiative, and anticipates needs or potential issues to ensure smooth academic operations. | 4.44 | 0.44 | Very Satisfactory |
| Understand the importance of punctuality and reliability, consistently showing up on time and fulfilling their obligations. | 4.38 | 0.43 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.45 | 0.40 | Very Satisfactory |

Albay et al. (2024) reported that BEED graduates in Central Luzon showed strong reliability and punctuality, echoed by Samonte and De Guzman (2018) for NEUST education majors. Nationally, Cunningham and Villaseñor (2014) found punctuality, honesty, and commitment as top employer priorities. Panlaqui et al. (2022) and Tapadera et al. (2024) also highlighted dependability and initiative as top-rated traits.

Table 12 shows Communication Skills had a very satisfactory mean of 4.44 (s = 0.40). Top indicators were active listening (x̄ = 4.49) and verbal engagement (x̄ = 4.47), while clarity and empathy (both x̄ = 4.40) were slightly lower, suggesting minor areas for growth. Overall, results affirm BEED graduates’ strong interpersonal and classroom communication skills.

Table 12. Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates' workplace performance in communication skills

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Develop strong verbal communication skills to effectively engage students in discussion and posters in a participatory learning environment. | 4.47 | 0.45 | Very Satisfactory |
| Fosters a positive learning atmosphere rather than relying on negative teacher-student interactions. | 4.44 | 0.42 | Very Satisfactory |
| Conveys information clearly and concisely to their students. | 4.40 | 0.49 | Very Satisfactory |
| Practices empathy to connect with students emotionally and create a supportive learning environment. | 4.40 | 0.48 | Very Satisfactory |
| Practices active listening to understand the student's needs and concerns. | 4.49 | 0.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.44 | 0.40 | Very Satisfactory |

High scores in communication reflect BEED graduates’ clarity, empathy, and listening skills. Salendab and Ocariza-Salendab (2023) and Mamaclay and Santos (2023) emphasized empathetic and precise communication for inclusive classrooms. Sarsale et al. (2024), Miranda et al. (2022), and Leabres Jr. (2020) linked strong communication to employability and employer satisfaction, aligning with PPST Domain 4 and socio-emotional learning.

Leadership Skills:

Table 13 shows a very satisfactory mean of 4.47 (s = 0.39). Top-rated was “Establishes a supportive classroom” (x̄ = 4.53); lowest was on decision-making and peer influence (x̄ = 4.44), suggesting room for growth in broader leadership roles.

Table 13.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates' workplace performance in leadership skills.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Establishes a supportive and valuable classroom environment where students feel supported and valued. | 4.53 | 0.45 | Outstanding |
| Manages and organizes classroom activities effectively, ensuring that instructional time is maximized and students are engaged in meaningful learning experiences. | 4.44 | 0.42 | Very Satisfactory |
| Demonstrates strong communication skills, effectively conveying information and ideas to students, colleagues, and parents. | 4.47 | 0.40 | Very Satisfactory |
| Possess strong decision-making skills, making informed choices that benefit student learning. | 4.44 | 0.43 | Very Satisfactory |
| Influences others to take professional development and other teaching endeavors to improve student outcomes | 4.44 | 0.42 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.47 | 0.39 | Very Satisfactory |

BEED graduates are viewed as strong classroom leaders with effective communication, teamwork, and decision-making skills. Otermans et al. (2024) noted that soft skills are top global employer priorities. Salvador (2024), Orr (2024), and Shivarajan & Skowronski (2024) emphasized the value of initiative, collaboration, and adaptability, while Daugaard and Colbeck (2024) highlighted the role of real-world tasks in building leadership.

Table 14 shows a very satisfactory Commitment mean of 4.41 (s = 0.44). “Provides personalized guidance” was highest (x̄ = 4.47), showing inclusivity; “Practices effective attendance and punctuality” was lowest (x̄ = 4.37), indicating slight improvement needed in time management.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 14. Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance in the commitment. | | | |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Practices effective attendance and punctuality, shows up on time and is present for classes and meetings | 4.37 | 0.49 | Very Satisfactory |
| Demonstrates unwavering dedication to the education and well-being of the students. | 4.40 | 0.48 | Very Satisfactory |
| Invests time and resources to enhance their teaching methods and stay current with the latest educational practices. | 4.41 | 0.43 | Very Satisfactory |
| Fosters a positive and inclusive classroom environment where students feel valued, supported, and motivated to learn. | 4.41 | 0.49 | Very Satisfactory |
| Understand each student's unique needs and challenges and provide personalized attention and guidance to help them reach their full potential. | 4.47 | 0.47 | Very Satisfactory |
| Average | 4.41 | 0.44 | Very Satisfactory |

High ratings in the Commitment domain—especially in understanding student needs and offering individualized support—are supported by global studies. Mlambo et al. (2019) noted that teacher punctuality, consistency, and inclusive support are key to education quality. Dar and Jan (2023) highlighted employer focus on professional reliability and student engagement. Bonsu (2021) linked teacher commitment to job performance in Ghana, while Khodadad (2023) identified preparation and punctuality as key traits in Europe. Gao and Mohamad (2025) confirmed that soft skill development improves employer satisfaction with teacher performance.

Collaboration

Table 15 shows the highest average score across domains (x̄ = 4.50, s = 0.44), rated Exceptional. The top indicator—“Promotes a positive image of the organization through effective student service” (x̄ = 4.52)—reflects graduates’ professionalism and school advocacy. Strong participation in collaborative planning (x̄ = 4.51) shows their role in shared decision-making. The lowest-rated items, “Cooperates with others” and “Creates a sense of family” (x̄ = 4.47), remain Very Satisfactory but point to areas for growth in interpersonal dynamics.

These findings highlight BEED graduates’ strengths not only in teaching but also in building collegial and community-oriented school environments, aligning with PPST Domains 6 and 7.

Table 15.Level of employer feedback on BEED graduates’ workplace performance in the collaboration

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | Interpretation |
| Participates in collaborative planning and decision-making to collectively identify and address the diverse needs of the students. | 4.51 | 0.46 | Outstanding |
| Cooperates with others to help overcome problems and challenges in the school. | 4.47 | 0.47 | Very satisfied |
| Creates a sense of family in the workplace by assisting those who are having difficulty completing their assignments | 4.47 | 0.46 | Very satisfied |
| Demonstrates the organization's significant values in attaining its vision and mission. | 4.48 | 0.44 | Very satisfied |
| Promotes a positive image of the organization through serving the students effectively. | 4.52 | 0.45 | Outstanding |
| Average | 4.50 | 0.44 | Outstanding |

The exceptional average rating in the Collaboration domain (x̄ = 4.50) is backed by global research emphasizing the importance of teamwork, collegiality, and shared responsibility in teacher performance. Khoo et al. (2020) highlighted that employers highly value interpersonal collaboration for school integration. Mehrotra and Elias (2017) found that soft skills, particularly teamwork, often outweigh technical qualifications in education settings. Enaifoghe (2022) noted that collegiality strengthens trust and institutional cohesion. Ferns, Dawson, and Howitt (2019) linked employability to relationship-building and shared planning. Riebe (2022) further emphasized that teamwork boosts both student engagement and teacher satisfaction—echoing the strong evaluations received by BEED graduates.

**Differences in Employer Feedback in Terms of Age**

Table 16 presents the ANOVA results (F = 0.197, p = 0.898), which reveal no significant difference in feedback scores when respondents are grouped by age, suggesting that age does not influence employer assessments of BEED graduates. This implies a shared perception of graduate performance among evaluators, regardless of their generational background.

Table 16.Significant differences in employer feedback based on demographics (age).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 0.079 | 3 | 0.026 | 0.197 | 0.898 |
| Within Groups | 4.418 | 33 | 0.134 |  |  |
| Total | 4.497 | 36 |  |  |  |

Similarly, Salendab and Ocariza-Salendab (2023) found no significant differences in employer feedback based on demographics, including age, in evaluating BEED graduates. Gaytos et al. (2023) also noted consistent perceptions across age groups, suggesting that professional standards are upheld regardless of evaluator age.

**Differences in Employer Feedback in Terms of Gender**

Table 17 shows that, using a t-test, the result (t = 0.436, p = .666) indicates no statistically significant difference in graduate performance evaluation scores between the male and female groups. This suggests that gender does not influence employer perception of BEED graduates' teaching competencies.

Table 17.Significant differences in employer feedback based on demographics (gender).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ANOVA for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| Lower | Upper |
| Overall Performance | 0.436 | 35.000 | 0.666 | 0.052 | 0.120 | -0.191 | 0.295 |

Supporting this, Reyes et al. (2021) found no significant gender difference in STEAM assessment and instructional competence among higher education teachers. Similarly, Pascua and Navalta (2011) reported that gender did not significantly affect English proficiency or performance in teacher licensure outcomes. In a study of BEED graduates, Amanonce (2020) revealed that professional success and instructional ratings were consistent across gender lines. Lastly, Panlaqui et al. (2022) applied a t-test to compare perceptions of teaching quality and reported no significant variation between male and female respondents. These findings validate the neutrality of gender in evaluating BEED graduate performance in your study.

**Differences in Employer Feedback in Terms of Position**

Table 18 shows the ANOVA output (F = 0.094, p = .911), which confirms that the respondents' job titles—whether principal, head teacher, or school in charge—did not significantly influence their evaluations of BEED graduates. This finding implies a consistent perception of graduate competencies across supervisory roles.

Table 18.Significant differences in employer feedback based on demographics (position).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 0.025 | 2 | 0.012 | 0.094 | 0.911 |
| Within Groups | 4.473 | 34 | 0.132 |  |  |
| Total | 4.497 | 36 |  |  |  |

Supporting this, Salendab and Ocariza-Salendab (2023) found that assessments of BEED graduates were statistically similar regardless of the professional designation of the evaluators. German et al. (2021) also used ANOVA and reported uniform performance ratings of engineering graduates across different managerial evaluators, reinforcing the neutrality of job titles in such evaluations.

Similarly, Panlaqui et al. (2022) noted that respondents' job positions did not influence their ratings of the employability of education graduates. Cuizon (2020) emphasized the value of role-independent criteria when assessing teacher competencies, especially in large-scale tracer or evaluation studies. These findings collectively support the conclusion that job title is not a determinant of employer perception, thereby enhancing the credibility of your data set.

**Differences in Employer Feedback in Terms of Years in Service**

ANOVA results (F = 1.475, p = .239) showed no significant difference in feedback based on respondents’ years of service, indicating consistent evaluations of BEED graduates across experience levels. This aligns with Donahue and Vogel (2018), who found that both novice and veteran educators provide valid assessments when using standardized rubrics that reduce experience-based bias.

Table 19.Significant differences in employer feedback based on demographics (years in service).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 0.532 | 3 | 0.177 | 1.475 | 0.239 |
| Within Groups | 3.966 | 33 | 0.120 |  |  |
| Total | 4.497 | 36 |  |  |  |

Similarly, Trygstad (2020) found no significant difference in feedback reliability between novice and veteran science educators when institutional training was in place. Williams and Hebert (2020) emphasized that evaluation systems are most effective when guided by shared standards, regardless of evaluator tenure. Losser et al. (2018) also reported aligned evaluation outcomes across experience levels due to professional development. Kraft and Gilmour (2016) concluded that consistency in evaluations depends more on system design and leadership than on evaluator experience.

**Differences in Employer Feedback in Terms of District**

The ANOVA result (F = 0.620, p = .607) reveals no significant difference in feedback across district groupings, suggesting a high degree of consistency in how BEED graduates are evaluated regardless of school location. This supports the implication that employer perceptions remain stable across geographic divisions, reinforcing the credibility of the feedback.

Table 20.Significant differences in employer feedback based on demographics (district).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| Between Groups | 0.240 | 3 | 0.080 | 0.620 | 0.607 |
| Within Groups | 4.257 | 33 | 0.129 |  |  |
| Total | 4.497 | 36 |  |  |  |

The finding that school district grouping does not significantly affect how BEED graduates are evaluated reinforces the consistency and objectivity of employer feedback. Smith et al. (2020) and Larios (2025) found that standardized evaluation frameworks and mentorship systems yield consistent results across districts. McMaster and Lembke (2024) similarly confirmed inter-district alignment through training-based frameworks, while Saunders et al. (2019) emphasized that structured leadership protocols reduce district-level discrepancies.

These results support the strong and consistent performance ratings of BEED graduates in collaboration (x̄ = 4.50), leadership (x̄ = 4.47), and assessment (x̄ = 4.46), affirming Becker’s Human Capital Theory (1964). This theory highlights how education enhances productivity and labor market value. The BEED program clearly transforms student potential into employable, competent professionals by cultivating both cognitive (e.g., subject knowledge) and non-cognitive skills (e.g., communication, flexibility).

Supporting this, Salendab and Ocariza-Salendab (2023) and Tapadera et al. (2024) found that BEED graduates exhibit strong teaching adaptability and interpersonal skills. Gonzales and Vinluan (2019) linked employer satisfaction to robust academic training, while Batisla-ong (2022) and Caingcoy and Barroso (2020) highlighted key workplace competencies like leadership and collaboration. Altogether, these findings demonstrate that BEED graduates represent strong returns on educational investment, as predicted by Human Capital Theory.

**6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Conclusion**

Based on the findings, this paper concluded:

1. Most respondents providing feedback on BEED graduates are female school principals, aged 41–60, with over 16 years of service, and predominantly from the Cateel 2 District. Their extensive experience and leadership roles underscore the credibility and reliability of the feedback gathered, offering valuable insights into the graduates’ workplace performance.
2. The BEED graduates of Davao Oriental State University – Cateel Campus are performing at a very satisfactory level across key teaching domains, as perceived by their employers. The highest rating was in collaboration, indicating strong teamwork, professionalism, and community engagement. Other areas, such as Leadership, Subject Knowledge, Classroom Management, Assessment, Communication, and Dependability, were also rated highly, confirming the graduates' readiness for professional teaching roles. While Flexibility and Adaptability received the lowest score among the domains, it still reflected a strong performance, indicating a need for further enhancement in managing educational changes. Overall, the study affirms that the BEED program is effective in preparing competent, reliable, and collaborative educators, with minor areas for improvement that could be addressed through targeted curriculum and training development.
3. The absence of significant differences in employer feedback across demographic variables—age, gender, position, years in service, and district—strongly affirms the consistency, impartiality, and credibility of the evaluations. This indicates that BEED graduates from Davao Oriental State University – Cateel Campus are perceived to perform consistently well regardless of who evaluates them or where they are deployed. The findings reinforce that the assessment of their competencies is grounded in shared professional standards, not influenced by personal or positional biases, thereby validating the strength and reliability of the employer feedback in this study.

**Recommendation**

Based on the study’s results and conclusion, the following recommendations were made:

1. Future tracer studies may aim for a broader geographical reach, extending beyond the three municipalities (Boston, Cateel, and Baganga) to gather more diverse employer insights, thereby enhancing the generalizability of the findings.
2. Intensify Experiential and Contextual Learning- Provide more exposure to diverse teaching situations through enhanced practicum placements, immersion in remote or multi-grade schools, and scenario-based classroom simulations to strengthen real-time decision-making and responsiveness.
3. Future researchers may explore qualitative insights for depth, as quantitative data revealed no significant differences. Future studies may benefit from qualitative interviews or focus groups to gain deeper insights into subtle perceptions or context-based observations that statistical measures may not capture.
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