



Peer-Review Report Form

Manuscript Title:	Academic Training and Workplace Competency among Working Business Administration Students in Valencia City, Bukidnon
Type of Article:	Original Article

FIRST ROUND

Editor

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The reviewers acknowledge the significance of your manuscript and recommend several revisions to further improve its clarity, coherence, organization, and overall scholarly quality. In addition, you are advised to thoroughly review and validate all references included in the manuscript. Please ensure that all cited sources are accurate, accessible, and retrievable through Google Scholar to uphold the credibility and reliability of the study. Additionally, make sure to include the DOI or website link for every reference to facilitate verification and accessibility of sources. Furthermore, only sources that are cited within the manuscript should appear in the References section, and all entries listed in the References section must also be cited in the text. For example, if 20 unique sources are cited in the manuscript, then only those 20 sources should be included in the References section. Please note that repeated citations of the same source within the text are counted as a single reference entry; therefore, the total number of references may be lower than the total number of in-text citations.

Reviewer 1

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
Your manuscript explores the connection between academic preparation and professional competence for students who hold jobs. The topic is very relevant today. We often see gaps between theoretical education and practical application. Your choice to evaluate third year and fourth year business students in Valencia City is practical. However, to satisfy the strict criteria of the journal, the paper needs substantial revisions. The flow of ideas requires more cohesion. Furthermore, you must anchor your variables more firmly to your theoretical framework. Right now, Expectancy Theory is mentioned but not fully integrated into the subsequent sections. The statistical approach is basic and would benefit from advanced predictive models to truly validate the proposed connections.



<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>	
Title	The title is clear but a bit too broad. It mentions higher education, yet your sample only includes business students from one institution. I suggest you revise the title to reflect the specific population and context more accurately.
Abstract	The abstract gives a decent summary, but you need to remove redundant phrases. You state the study found that students have high confidence, and then you repeat similar points. Please present the exact p values and effect sizes here instead of mere qualitative labels. Also, the final sentence about what the study failed to address is better suited for the limitation section, not the abstract.
Introduction	You provide a good background on the global economic situation and student challenges. However, the transition to Expectancy Theory is abrupt. Victor Vroom proposed this theory, but how exactly do the three components of expectancy, instrumentality, and valence map to your variables of communication, analytical, and technical skills? You must explicitly connect these dots. A solid theoretical framework cannot just be a decoration; it must drive the entire research model. Furthermore, some paragraphs lack proper transitions. You jump from management education debates directly to student struggles without a smooth bridge.
Methodology	A descriptive correlational design is appropriate. You used a five-point Likert scale and achieved acceptable reliability alphas above 0.70. This is commendable. However, simple random selection is claimed, but were all night shift students in Bukidnon truly part of your accessible population? You need to clarify your inclusion criteria. Also, a sample of one hundred students is quite small for robust correlational analysis. Did you perform a power analysis to justify this number? Please include details about this. Additionally, you mention adherence to RA 10173. You also need to state if an institutional ethics committee provided formal ethical clearance with a protocol number.
Results	Your tables are informative. Table 1 shows a mean of 4.16 for academic preparation. Table 2 shows an overall mean of 4.10 for communication skills. However, your text often merely repeats the table contents. Instead of a simple repetition, you should highlight the most critical contrasts. For example, why did respondents rate data analysis lowest among analytical skills? You should provide standard deviations more consistently in your narrative. In Table 3, you report an r value of 0.711, but the text mentions 0.817. You must fix this discrepancy immediately as it casts doubt on your data accuracy.
Discussion	This section needs the most work. You cite various authors to support your results, which is good practice. Yet, the synthesis is weak. You list summaries of other papers rather than integrate them critically with your own data. For instance, when you discuss technical skills, you cite Birt and Farley, but you do not explain how their contexts compare to your specific Bukidnon sample. To elevate this manuscript to an elite level, you must deepen the analysis. Connect your results back to the Expectancy Theory you introduced earlier. How do the results prove or disprove the theoretical assumptions?
Conclusion and Recommendations	



Your conclusion restates the high levels of preparation and competence. It should instead offer a profound final thought on the implications for outcomes-based education. Your recommendations are somewhat generic. For instance, to advise faculty to adopt project-based methods is a standard idea. How specifically should they do this based on your unique results related to data analysis weaknesses? Make your recommendations highly specific to your data.

References

Please check all entries for strict adherence to the journal format. Some references appear incomplete or lack proper DOI links. Ensure consistency across all citations.

Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
☐	Accept the manuscript for publication.
☐	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
☐	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

Reviewer 2

<u>General Comments and Recommendations</u>
The topic is useful and relevant, but I have a serious concern regarding the validity of the main finding. Academic training and workplace competency were measured from the same respondents, using the same self-report questionnaire and at the same time. The manuscript also states that the instrument was adapted and modified, but the original sources, item development, validation procedures, and evidence that the two constructs are really distinct were not sufficiently presented. Because of this, the strong correlation may partly result from common method bias or similarity of the questionnaire items, rather than an actual relationship between academic training and workplace competency.
<u>Specific Comments and Recommendations</u>
The authors interpreted the correlation as evidence that academic training enhances workplace competency, even though both variables only represent students' personal perceptions and no objective measure of academic training or actual workplace performance was included. The authors need to provide the complete basis and validation of the instrument, examine whether the constructs are empirically separate, and discuss common method bias. Ideally, workplace competency should also be assessed through supervisors, employers, performance records, or other independent evidence. Without addressing this major methodological issue, the conclusion that academic training improves workplace competency is not sufficiently supported.



Please indicate your recommendation by checking the appropriate box below.

<u>Decision</u>	
	Accept the manuscript for publication.
/	Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.
	Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.

SECOND ROUND

<u>Decision</u>	<u>Editor</u>	<u>Reviewer 1</u>	<u>Reviewer 2</u>
Accept the manuscript for publication.	/	/	/
Reconsider the manuscript after the authors have satisfactorily addressed and complied with the reviewers' comments and recommendations.			
Reject the manuscript, as it is not suitable for publication.			