International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications
ISSN (Online): 2581-6187

Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda, Bernardita M. Rosales
Email address: raysamuel.grecalda@lspu.edu.ph, bernarditarosales@lspu.edu.ph

Abstract*—This study aimed to develop an action plan for the enhancement of the quality of the graduates of Doctor of Education of Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz Campus. The researchers utilize the descriptive survey approach for this study specially a correlational research design to analyze and examine the relationship between graduates and their performance in the workplace based on their employers' feedback. Twenty-five (25) graduates of Doctor of Education program of Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Campus were the selected respondents of the study. The profile indicates that the respondents are mostly aged 41-50 years old, female, married, in service for 21-30 years, in Master Teacher position, earning Php41,000-Php50,999 monthly, employed in basic and secondary public schools, and promoted after 3 years in higher level teaching position. The weighted mean scores of 3.83, 3.81, 3.83, and 3.93 have shown that the employers' feedback on Leadership, Thinking, Communication, and Technology Skills, respectively, are Excellent. Likewise, the weighted mean scores of 3.78, 3.78, 3.95, and 3.83 have also shown that the key performance indicators of the graduates on Productivity, Goal Attainment, Adaptability, and Innovation, respectively, are Excellent. According to the calculated p-values, profiles do not have a substantial impact on the feedback and important performance indicators given by the respondents' employers. As such, the hypothesis stating that demographic profiles do not significantly affect the respondents' employer's feedback and key performance indicators is accepted. The computed p-values have shown that employer's feedback significantly affect the key performance indicators of the graduates. As such, the hypothesis stating that employer's feedback does not significantly affect the key performance indicators of the graduates is rejected. The researchers recommend to: (1.) Develop a comprehensive curriculum implementation plan for the Doctor of Education program to enhance competencies in educational management, leadership, and instructional implementation; (2.) Investigate factors contributing to strengths in Leadership, Thinking, and Communication skills, and explore ways to strengthen Technology skills; and (3.) Establish a continuous feedback mechanism between the university and employers to ensure the relevance and quality of the Doctor of Education program*.

***Keywords*—** *Profile, Employer's feedback, Leadership, Thinking, Communication, Technology, Key performance, Productivity, Goal attainment, Adaptability, Innovation*.

I. INTRODUCTION

Laguna State Polytechnic University has offered graduate programs such as Doctor of Education since 2007. In the past decade it produced graduates coming from the province and other provinces in Region IV. The University aims to produce quality graduates that will perform vital roles in the educational system and the demand of the global community in which it will attain through curriculum design, qualified professors, facilities, and holistic learning experiences. Furthermore, the university aimed for the success of their graduates who might serve in the respective community. The high employability of graduates demonstrates the superior education and practical training they received through their various degree programs. Higher education organizations may use tracer studies to create profiles of their graduates and assess the caliber of their education. Tuffer and Ellis (2023) state that flow of feedback is important for everyone, but all too often, it ends up feeling forced, formal, and infrequent. As a result, people's development stalls and team growth are stifled. To overcome these challenges, managers can take the lead on creating a shared understanding of what feedback is for, increasing the speed and ease of feedback, and unlocking difficult conversations through the art of asking. The authors present several strategies for creating a culture of fearlessness and frequent feedback.

Employer's feedback is the result of performance review of the employees in the conduct of their duty; thus, it is very vital in the decision making and design of curriculum and career development plans of the students in a university (Mendoza, E.O., 2021). Producing employable graduates even in the post graduate degree has become an important part of any University or College concerns in the education process. The full educational spectrum of values starts from imparting knowledge and understanding up to the development of skills and attitudes. While Higher Education Institutions are doing a great job according to the demands of community, there is always room for improvement in relation to the performance of the graduates in the workplace.

The study will give information to the institution on how to draft a comprehensive curriculum implementation plan to the Doctor of Education students to achieve expected competencies in educational management such as leadership skills and instructional implementor of the existing curriculum. Hamlin and Stewart's (2011) review of the literature in which they proposed four core purposes of HRD: "improving individual or group effectiveness and performance"; "improving organizational effectiveness and

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda and Bernardita M. Rosales, "Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 10, pp. 70-76, 2026.

performance"; "developing knowledge, skills and competencies"; and "enhancing human potential and personal growth." The researcher wants to determine the performance of the graduates in terms of Leadership, Thinking, Communication, and Technology Skills relevant in their current employment, difficulties they encountered and recommendations to strengthen the graduate program of the College of Teacher Education.

This study will be beneficial to Laguna State Polytechnic University, Sta. Cruz Campus as a Basis for Development Plan.

The specific objectives of this study are:

1.To identify the profile of the graduates with regards to their Age, Sex, Civil Status, Length of Service, Present Position, Salary, Education Level where respondent was employed, Type of School, Promotion Status, and Length of Promotion;
2.To determine the employers' feedback on Leadership, Thinking, Communication, and Technology Skills, of the graduates in their community/ workplace;
3.To determine the key performance indicators of the graduates on Productivity, Goal Attainment, Adaptability, and Innovation;
4.To test the significant effect of respondent's profile to their employers' feedback and key performance indicators;
5.To test the significant effect of employer's feedback on the key performance indicators of the graduates; and
6. To formulate action plan for the enhancement of the quality of the graduates.

II. Methodology

The researchers will utilize the descriptive survey approach for this study specially a correlational research design to analyze and examine the relationship between graduates and their performance in the workplace based on their employers' feedback. According to Mc Combes (2019), the most common data collection methods for this type of research include surveys, observation and secondary data (data from previous studies).

The respondents of the study will be all the graduates of Doctor of Education program of Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Campus. The researchers will administer the self-made questionnaire, consisting of forty (40) statements in determining the relationship of LSPU Santa Cruz graduates of Doctoral Programs and their performance on their workplace. Questionnaires upon approval from a pool of experts will be distributed by the researchers to the respondents in different education institutions, the responses will be tabulated for the statistical treatment data. Frequency distribution will be applied to describe the profile of the respondents. Mean, standard deviation, and weighted mean will be used to determine the employer's feedback and key performance indicators of the graduates. Chi square test for independence will be used to determine the significant effect of respondent's profile to their employers' feedback and key performance indicators. Linear regression analysis will be used to find the effect of employer's feedback on the key performance indicators of the graduates.

III. Results And Discussion

Profile of the Graduates

Table 1 presents the profile of the graduates with regards to their age, sex, civil status, length of service, present position, salary, education level where respondent was employed, type of school, promotion status, and length of promotion.

TABLE 1. Profile of the Graduates

Profile	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
Age			
25 – 30 years old	3	12.0%	3
31 – 40 years old	3	12.0%	3
41 – 50 years old	16	64.0%	1
51 years old and above	3	12.0%	3
Sex			
Male	10	40.0%	2
Female	15	60.0%	1
Civil Status			
Single	6	24.0%	2.5
Married	13	52.0%	1
Widower	6	24.0%	2.5
Separated	0	0.0%	4
Length of Service			
20 years and below	7	28.0%	2
21 – 30 years	15	60.0%	1
31 years and above	3	12.0%	3
Present Position			
Public School District Supervisor	2	8.0%	5.5
Principal	4	16.0%	3.5
School Head	0	0.0%	7
Assistant Professor	4	16.0%	3.5
Master Teacher	7	28.0%	1
Teacher III	6	24.0%	2
Head Teacher	2	8.0%	5.5
Salary Range			
Php 20,000 – Php 29,999	6	24.0%	2.5
Php 30,000 – Php 40,999	2	8.0%	5
Php 41,000 – Php 50,999	7	28.0%	1
Php 51,000 – Php 60,999	4	16.0%	4
Php 61,000 and above	6	24.0%	2.5
Education Level where Respondents are Employed			
Basic	10	40.0%	1.5
Secondary	10	40.0%	1.5
Senior High School	0	0.0%	4
Tertiary	5	20.0%	3
Type of School			
Public	25	100.0%	1
Private	0	0.0%	2
Promotion Status Period of Promotion after Graduation			
After 1 year	2	8.0%	4
After 1 year but less than 2 years	2	8.0%	4
After 2 years	5	20.0%	2
After 2 years but less than 3 years	2	8.0%	4
After 3 years	14	56.0%	1
Level of Promotion			
Higher level rank (Administrative position)	10	40.0%	2
Higher level teaching position	15	60.0%	1

The largest age group is 41-50 years old (F=16, 64.0%), followed by 21-30 years old, 31-40 years old, and 51+ years old age groups each having 3 individuals. Female graduates significantly outnumber males: 15 females (60.0%) vs. 10 males (40.0%). Married graduates form the largest group (F=13, 52.0%), while single graduates account for 6 individuals (24.0%) and widowed graduates totaling to 6

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda and Bernardita M. Rosales, "Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 10, pp. 70-76, 2026.

individuals (24.0%). Most graduates (F=14, 56.0%) have 21-30 years of service while only 4 graduates (16.0%) serve for equal to or more than 31 years. Master Teacher (F=7, 28.0%) and Teacher III (F=7, 28.0%) are the most common positions. The most common salary range is Php 41,000-50,999 with recorded 7 individuals (28.0%) while only 2 (8.0%) are earning salaries between Php 30,000-40,999. All respondents are evidently employed; with Basic and Secondary education levels each have 10 individuals (40.0%) and only 5 (20.0%) under the tertiary level. All graduates (F=25, 100%) are in public schools and the promotion data show that most of them (F=9, 36.0%) received promotion after 5 years, while equal numbers (F=2 each, 8.0%) were promoted immediately after graduation, after 1 year but less than 2 years, after 2 years but less than 3 years, and after 3 years. There are 15 graduates (60.0%) who received a change in rank within the same track while 10 individuals (40.0%) were promoted to administrative positions.

Employers' Feedback on Leadership, Thinking, Communication, and Technology Skills of the Graduates in their Community/Workplace

The following tables show the employers' feedback on leadership, thinking, communication, and technology skills, of the graduates in their community/ workplace.

TABLE 2. Employers' Feedback on Leadership Skills of Graduates in their Community/Workplace

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Does the job with professionalism	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
2. Shows honesty and dedication to work at all times	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
3. Maintains a healthy and upright leadership	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
4. Shows commitment in doing the job	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
5. Able to know ahead of time how people will respond to a new idea	3.64	0.49	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.83**		**Excellent**

Table 2 presents the employers' feedback on leadership skills of the graduates in their community/workplace. The first four items have a mean score of 3.88 with a standard deviation of 0.33, and each is verbally interpreted as "Strongly Agree". The fifth item shows a slightly lower mean score of 3.64 and a higher standard deviation of 0.49, though it is still interpreted as "Strongly Agree."

The weighted mean across all items is 3.83, which is interpreted as "Excellent". This table indicates that employers overwhelmingly approve of the leadership skills exhibited by the graduates. The uniformity of scores for most items suggests that, aside from a minor variance in anticipating responses to new ideas, the leadership capabilities (professionalism, honesty, dedication, and commitment) are consistently strong across the board.

Table 3 presents the employers' feedback on thinking skills of the graduates in their community/workplace. The statements "Able to think both strategically and operationally" and "Recognizes cause-and-effect relationships" received the highest mean scores of 3.88, with a low standard deviation of 0.33, indicating strong agreement and consistency among respondents. The remaining three statements scored slightly lower at 3.76, with a higher standard deviation of 0.44, but still fall under the "Strongly Agree" category.

TABLE 3. Employers' Feedback on Thinking Skills of Graduates in their Community/Workplace

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Able to think both strategically and operationally	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
2. Able to evaluate information in making decisions	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
3. Evaluates personal contribution to the workplace and discover ways to improve performance	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
4. Analyzes own thought process when making certain decisions	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
5. Recognizes cause-and-effect relationships	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.81**		**Excellent**

The weighted mean of 3.81 indicates an Excellent overall evaluation of graduates' thinking skills. The data reflects that employers perceive graduates as highly skilled in thinking strategically, evaluating information, analyzing their thought processes, and recognizing cause-and-effect relationships. The consistently high scores and "Excellent" overall rating suggest that graduates meet or exceed expectations in their thinking skills within the workplace or community.

TABLE 4. Employers' Feedback on Communication Skills of Graduates in their Community/Workplace

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Able to prepare and deliver effective presentations to different audience	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
2. Able to communicate clearly and concisely	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
3. Capable of influencing others through different modes of communication, either oral or written	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
4. Effectively organizes information for presentation	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
5. Constructs and delivers persuasive arguments	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.83**		**Excellent**

Table 4 presents the employers' feedback on communication skills of the graduates in their community/workplace. The data indicates that employers strongly agree with the graduates' communication skills across all five evaluated areas. This suggests that employers are very satisfied with the communication skills of the graduates. The highest-rated skills (mean = 3.88) include the ability to prepare and deliver presentations, communicate clearly, and influence others through various communication modes.

The overall weighted mean of 3.83 suggests that graduates' communication skills are rated as "Excellent" by employers. The data suggests that graduates are well-prepared in communication skills, which is a critical competency in the workplace.

Table 5 presents the employers' feedback on technology skills of the graduates in their community/workplace.

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda and Bernardita M. Rosales, "Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 10, pp. 70-76, 2026.

Statements 1, 4, and 5 received the maximum score of 4.00, showing that graduates excel in these areas. A 0.00 SD for statements 1, 4, and 5 indicates that all employers gave the same score, showing complete agreement. Statements 2 and 3 have slightly higher SDs (0.33 and 0.44, respectively), indicating minor variability in employer responses. All statements are interpreted as "Strongly Agree", reflecting a high level of satisfaction with graduates' technology skills.

TABLE 5. Employers' Feedback on Technology Skills of Graduates in their Community/Workplace

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Capable of using technology appropriate to the assigned tasks	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
2. Open to new situations, solutions, and ideas	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
3. Connects with individuals in the field and develops professional network to enhance technological skills	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
4. Capable of identifying personal technological strengths and skills and the areas to improve	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
5. Able to interact with the digital world	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.93**		**Excellent**

The overall average score across all statements is 3.93, which is interpreted as "Excellent." Employers rate graduates' technology skills very highly, with strengths in using technology for tasks, identifying personal strengths, and interacting with the digital world. The overall feedback is overwhelmingly positive, indicating that graduates are well-prepared to meet technological demands in the workplace.

Key Performance Indicators of the Graduates on Productivity, Goal Attainment, Adaptability, and Innovation

The following tables show the key performance indicators of the graduates on productivity, goal attainment, adaptability, and innovation.

TABLE 6. Key Performance Indicators of the Graduates on Productivity

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Utilizes resources to its maximum level with initiative and resourcefulness	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
2. Submits requirements/forms on time	3.72	0.46	Strongly Agree
3. Joins all activities with enthusiasm	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
4. Skilled in organizing personal tasks, managing time efficiently, and maintaining a reliable schedule	3.64	0.49	Strongly Agree
5. Accounts for both the quantity and quality of outputs	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.78**		**Excellent**

Table 6 presents the key performance indicators of the graduates on productivity. Statement 3 ("Joins all activities with enthusiasm") has the highest mean score of 4.00, indicating unanimous agreement and enthusiasm among graduates. The SD for this statement is 0.00, showing no variability in responses. Statement 4 ("Skilled in organizing personal tasks, managing time efficiently, and maintaining a reliable schedule") has the lowest mean score of 3.64, suggesting slightly lower performance in this area compared to others.

The data indicates that graduates are performing well across all productivity indicators, with strength in enthusiasm for activities (Statement 3). However, there is room for improvement in organizing personal tasks and managing time efficiently (Statement 4). The overall performance is "Excellent," as reflected by the weighted mean of 3.78.

TABLE 7. Key Performance Indicators of Graduates on Goal Attainment

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Capable of taking responsibility for tasks, providing direction, establishing structure, and delegating responsibilities to others	3.64	0.49	Strongly Agree
2. Capable of seeing the bigger picture	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
3. Skilled at recognizing the interconnections among various elements	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
4. Capable of achieving goals through effective cross-border collaboration	3.72	0.46	Strongly Agree
5. Proficient in setting goals and effectively allocating time to achieve them	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.78**		**Excellent**

Table 7 presents the key performance indicators of the graduates on goal attainment. Statement 2 ("Capable of seeing the bigger picture") received the highest mean score of 4.00 with zero standard deviation (SD=0.00), indicating unanimous agreement among respondents. This means that graduates demonstrate exceptional capability in seeing the bigger picture. Statement 1 ("Capable of taking responsibility for tasks...") received the lowest mean score of 3.64, though still in the "Strongly Agree" range.

The weighted mean across all productivity indicators is 3.78, which is interpreted as "Excellent." They are highly skilled at recognizing interconnections among various elements (Statement 3) and setting goals with effective time allocation (Statement 5). While still strong, their ability to take responsibility for tasks and establish structure (Statement 1) shows slightly more room for improvement compared to other indicators.

TABLE 8. Key Performance Indicators of the Graduates on Adaptability

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Does the job with passion	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
2. Fosters harmonious and healthy relationships with peers, colleagues, and supervisors	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
3. Reports to work promptly and regularly	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
4. Demonstrates adaptability and innovative problem-solving, with an open-minded approach to new situations	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
5. Proficient in teamwork and adept at employing interpersonal skills to cultivate strong relationships with colleagues, team members, and external stakeholders	4.00	0.00	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.95**		**Excellent**

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda and Bernardita M. Rosales, "Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 10, pp. 70-76, 2026.

Table 8 presents the key performance indicators of the graduates on adaptability. Three statements (1, 3, and 5) received perfect scores (4.00) with zero standard deviation, indicating unanimous agreement about graduates' passion, punctuality, and teamwork skills. The other two statements (2 and 4) scored slightly lower at 3.88 but still reflect very strong performance. The low standard deviations across all statements indicate strong consensus among respondents about graduates' adaptability skills.

The extremely high weighted mean (3.95) demonstrates that graduates excel in adaptability overall. The table suggests that the graduates have exceptional adaptability skills, with particular strengths in passion for their work, punctuality, and teamwork abilities.

TABLE 9. Key Performance Indicators of the Graduates on Innovation

Statements	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Skilled in critically and logically analyzing problems and situations	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
2. Capable of effectively translating theoretical concepts into practical applications	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
3. Recognizes and develops innovative approaches to problem-solving	3.76	0.44	Strongly Agree
4. Adaptable and responsive to change	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
5. Takes accountability for the consequences of one's actions	3.88	0.33	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	**3.83**		**Excellent**

Table 9 presents the key performance indicators of the graduates on innovation. All five statements are rated with a verbal interpretation of "Strongly Agree", indicating a high level of agreement with the statements. Graduates excel in being adaptable, accountable, and capable of translating theoretical concepts into practical applications, as these indicators have the highest mean scores (3.88). While still rated highly, the indicators related to critical/logical analysis and innovative problem-solving have slightly lower mean scores (3.76). The SD values are either 0.44 or 0.33, indicating relatively low variability in responses, suggesting consistency in the ratings.

The overall weighted mean is 3.83, which corresponds to an "Excellent" verbal interpretation. The table reflects that graduates demonstrate strong innovation-related skills, with an overall excellent performance. The data suggests that graduates are well-prepared to analyze problems, adapt to changes, and take accountability, which are critical for innovation.

Test of Significant Effect of Respondent's Profile to their Employers' Feedback

In determining the significant effect of respondent's profile on their employers' feedback and key performance indicators of the graduates, the data were analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H-test.

Table 10 displays the significant effect of respondent's profile to their employers' feedback.

TABLE 10. Test of Significant Effect of Respondent's Profile to their Employers' Feedback

Profile	Employer's Feeback											
	Leadership Skills			Thinking Skills			Communication Skills			Technology Skills		
	H-stat	p-value	Analysis	H-stat	p-value	Analysis	H-stat	p-value	Analysis	H-stat	p-value	Analysis
Age	11.918	0.001	Significant	11.918	0.001	Significant	7.958	0.003	Significant	4.583	0.042	Significant
Gender	0.007	0.922	Not Significant	0.007	0.922	Not Significant	0.443	0.373	Not Significant	0.028	0.824	Not Significant
Civil Status	3.493	0.089	Not Significant	3.493	0.089	Not Significant	2.820	0.080	Not Significant	1.702	0.218	Not Significant
Length of Service	8.172	0.004	Significant	8.172	0.004	Significant	8.042	0.001	Significant	4.719	0.015	Significant
Present Position	2.048	0.726	Not Significant	2.048	0.726	Not Significant	4.084	0.198	Not Significant	4.744	0.131	Not Significant
Salary Range	1.433	0.739	Not Significant	1.433	0.739	Not Significant	2.878	0.272	Not Significant	3.999	0.128	Not Significant
Education Level where Respondents are Employed	0.186	0.880	Not Significant	0.186	0.880	Not Significant	0.116	0.901	Not Significant	0.255	0.796	Not Significant
Type of School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promotion Status												
Period of Promotion after Graduation	2.076	0.580	Not Significant	2.076	0.580	Not Significant	1.448	0.628	Not Significant	1.567	0.591	Not Significant
Level of Promotion	0.173	0.625	Not Significant	0.173	0.625	Not Significant	0.788	0.235	Not Significant	1.111	0.158	Not Significant

Age and length of service are the only profile factors that have statistically significant effects on all four skill categories (Leadership, Thinking, Communication, and Technology Skills) since the p-values are much lower than the level of significance of 0.05 across the employer's feedback. Other factors, such as gender and civil status, do not show significant effects on employers' feedback since the p-values are much greater than the level of significance of 0.05.

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda and Bernardita M. Rosales, "Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 10, pp. 70-76, 2026.

Since majority of findings show that the effect is not statistically significant between the profile and employer's feedback, then the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that the data does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that these profile factors have an impact on employer's feedback, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Table 11 displays the significant effect of respondent's profile to their key performance indicators.

Age and Length of Service are the most influential factors, significantly affecting all four performance indicators, since the p-values are much lower than the level of significance of 0.05 across all indicators. Civil Status also influences Goal Attainment (p=0.028) and Adaptability (p=0.006), while Gender only influences Adaptability (p=0.027). The other profile factors examined do not significantly influence the performance indicators.

TABLE 11. Test of Significant Effect of Respondent's Profile to their Key Performance Indicators

Profile	Key Performance Indicators											
	Productivity			Goal Attainment			Adaptability			Innovation		
	H-stat	p-value	Analysis	H-stat	p-value	Analysis	H-stat	p-value	Analysis	H-stat	p-value	Analysis
Age	14.209	0.001	Significant	13.960	0.001	Significant	7.615	0.000	Significant	13.551	0.000	Significant
Gender	2.001	0.128	Not Significant	0.692	0.373	Not Significant	1.558	0.027	Significant	0.007	0.923	Not Significant
Civil Status	6.164	0.284	Not Significant	6.207	0.028	Significant	3.288	0.006	Significant	3.493	0.093	Not Significant
Length of Service	15.979	0.000	Significant	13.023	0.001	Significant	7.615	0.000	Significant	8.668	0.003	Significant
Present Position	2.640	0.692	Not Significant	2.818	0.664	Not Significant	1.297	0.537	Not Significant	1.601	0.823	Not Significant
Salary Range	2.453	0.586	Not Significant	2.720	0.538	Not Significant	0.335	0.901	Not Significant	1.075	0.833	Not Significant
Education Level where Respondents are Employed	0.374	0.806	Not Significant	0.271	0.856	Not Significant	0.115	0.834	Not Significant	0.223	0.859	Not Significant
Type of School	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Promotion Status Period of Promotion after Graduation	3.390	0.417	Not Significant	2.999	0.487	Not Significant	1.228	0.424	Not Significant	2.227	0.552	Not Significant
Level of Promotion	0.001	0.976	Not Significant	0.003	0.953	Not Significant	0.019	0.806	Not Significant	0.062	0.771	Not Significant

TABLE 12. Test of Significant Effect of Employers' Feedback on Key Performance Indicators

Employer's Feedback	Key Performance Indicators											
	Productivity			Goal Attainment			Adaptability			Innovation		
	Beta Coeff	p-value	Analysis	Beta Coeff	p-value	Analysis	Beta Coeff	p-value	Analysis	Beta Coeff	p-value	Analysis
Leadership Skills	0.765	0.000	Significant	0.576	0.000	Significant	0.394	0.000	Significant	0.811	0.000	Significant
Thinking Skills	0.922	0.000	Significant	0.799	0.000	Significant	0.373	0.000	Significant	0.936	0.000	Significant
Communication Skills	0.584	0.001	Significant	0.531	0.000	Significant	0.331	0.000	Significant	0.686	0.000	Significant
Technology Skills	0.673	0.113	Not Significant	0.929	0.009	Significant	0.327	0.092	Not Significant	0.888	0.023	Significant

This analysis suggests that demographic factors (particularly age) and professional experience (length of service) are more determinant of performance than factors like education level, salary, or position.

Since majority of findings show that the effect is not statistically significant between the profile and key performance indicators, then the null hypothesis is accepted. This means that the data does not provide sufficient evidence to conclude that these profile factors have an impact on performance, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis.

Test of Significant Effect of Employers' Feedback on Key Performance Indicators

In determining the significant effect of employers' feedback on the key performance indicators of the graduates, the data were analyzed using linear regression analysis.

Table 12 displays the significant effect of employers' feedback on key performance indicators.

Leadership skills have a significant effect on all key performance indicators (KPIs), with all p-values being 0.000 and Beta Coefficients ranging from 0.394 to 0.811. Thinking skills also have a significant effect on all KPIs, with p-values of 0.000 and Beta Coefficients ranging from 0.373 to 0.936. Communication skills significantly affect all KPIs, with p-values ranging from 0.000 to 0.001 and Beta Coefficients ranging from 0.331 to 0.686. Technology skills show mixed results: (1) Significant effects on Goal Attainment and

Dr. Ray Samuel G. Grecalda and Bernardita M. Rosales, "Employers' Feedback on the Performance of the Graduates of Doctor of Education at Laguna State Polytechnic University Santa Cruz Main Campus: Basis for GSAR Development Plan," *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications (IJMRAP)*, Volume 8, Issue 10, pp. 70-76, 2026.

Innovation, with p-values of 0.009 and 0.023, respectively; and (2) Not significant for Productivity and Adaptability, with p-values of 0.113 and 0.092, respectively.

The table highlights that Leadership Skills, Thinking Skills, and Communication Skills consistently have a significant positive effect on all KPIs. However, Technology Skills show a less consistent impact, with some KPIs (Productivity and Adaptability) not being significantly affected. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected since most of the findings are significant; hence, employers' feedback significantly affects the key performance indicators of the graduates.

IV. Conclusion And Recommendations

The following conclusions were drawn based on the findings of the study:

1. Profiles do not significantly affect the respondents' employer's feedback and key performance indicators; and
2. Employers' feedback significantly affect the key performance indicators of the graduates.

The following were recommended by the researchers based on the results of this study:

1. Develop a comprehensive curriculum implementation plan for the Doctor of Education program to enhance competencies in educational management, leadership, and instructional implementation.
2. Investigate factors contributing to strengths in Leadership, Thinking, and Communication skills, and explore ways to strengthen Technology skills.
3. Establish a continuous feedback mechanism between the university and employers to ensure the relevance and quality of the Doctor of Education program.

References

[1]. Aquino, A. B., Del Mundo, C. O., & Quizon, G. R. (2015). Employers' Feedback on the Performance of Teacher Education Graduates. Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 3(4), 67-73.
[2]. Babbie, E. R. (2023). The Practice of Social Research.
[3]. Buenvinida, L. P., Manaig, K. A., Rodriguez, M. T. M., Salandanan, F. H., Buama, C. A. C., & Tamban, V. E. (2023). A Tracer Study of the Doctor of Education Graduates in a State University in the Philippines. Transactions on Engineering and Computing Sciences, 11(2), 82–89. https://doi.org/10.14738/tecs.112.14498
[4]. Casanova, V. S., Paguia, W. M. (2022). Employability and Job Performance of Graduates of Occidental Mindoro State College Graduate School. Higher Education Studies, 12(2), 193-198. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v12n2p193
[5]. Constantino, P.A.L et.al. (2012). Empowering local people through community-based resource monitoring: a comparison between Brazil and Namibia. Ecology and Society 17(4): 22.
[6]. Dela Cruz, J. L. (2022). Tracer Study of Graduate School Graduates of a State Higher Education Institution in the Phillipines from 2016 to 2020. International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies. 10(2), 149-154. http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.10n,2p.149
[7]. Gregana, C.F., Espinueva, J.E., Pasia, A. E. and Ching, D. A. (2022). Employers' Feedback on the Job Performance of Graduates of One Higher Educational Institution in the Philippines. Industry and Academic Research Review, July 2022. ISSN 2719-146X.
[8]. Hamlin, B. and Stewart, J. (2011), "What is HRD? A definitional review and synthesis of the HRD domain", Journal of European Industrial Training, Vol. 35 No. 3, pp. 199-220. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090591111120377
[9]. Leadership Skills Questionnaire. https://us.sagepub.com/sites/default/files/upm-binaries/24173_P81_82.pdf
[10]. Mendoza, E. O. (2021). Employers' Feedback on the Quality of Work and Workplace Performance: Inputs to Career Development Strategies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education Perspective. 8(2), 10-17*.
[11]. Plantilla, A. M. (2017). Graduates Performance in the Workplace: Employer's Perspective. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research, 5(2), 186-198*.
[12]. Technical Skills & Competence Needs Assessment and Analysis Employers Questionnaire. (2019). The National Institute of Technology (Pty) Ltd (NIT)
[13]. Tuffer H. and Ellis S. (2023). How Managers Can Make Feedback a Team Habit How Managers Can Make Feedback a Team Habit (hbr.org)
[14]. Ways to Empower K–12 Students Beyond the Classroom – Schoolboxhttps://schoolbox.com.au