

Assessing the Readiness of Hospitality Management Students for TESDA Housekeeping NC II Certification: Implications for Competency-Based Curriculum Enhancement in a Philippine State University

Jessa Mae D. Plaza¹, Jessriel Dublas², Von Christian Deguito³, Jerrah Jane C. De Rosas, LPT, MBA⁴

Department of Hospitality Management, College of Business Management, North Eastern Mindanao State University Cagwait Campus, Cagwait, Surigao Del Sur

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600967>

Received: 21 June 2026; Accepted: 26 June 2026; Published: 9 July 2026

ABSTRACT

Competency-based certification has become an important indicator of workforce readiness in the hospitality industry. In the Philippines, the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) Housekeeping National Certificate II (NC II) serves as a national benchmark for assessing the practical skills required in accommodation and housekeeping operations. This study assessed the readiness of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students at North Eastern Mindanao State University–Cagwait Campus for Housekeeping NC II certification. Specifically, it determined the respondents' demographic profile, assessed their readiness in terms of Basic, Common, and Core Competencies, and examined whether significant differences existed when readiness was analyzed according to sex, age, and year level.

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design. Data were gathered from 100 BSHM students selected through stratified random sampling using a structured survey questionnaire based on TESDA Housekeeping NC II competency domains. Descriptive statistics, independent-samples *t*-test, and one-way analysis of variance were used to analyze the data.

Findings revealed that students were generally Not Ready for Housekeeping NC II certification across all competency domains, with mean scores of 1.64 for Basic Competencies, 1.66 for Common Competencies, and 1.67 for Core Competencies. A significant difference was found in Basic Competency readiness when grouped according to sex. Significant differences were also observed across all three competency domains when grouped according to age and year level. These results suggest that students' readiness is influenced by maturity, academic progression, and exposure to practical learning experiences.

The study concludes that stronger competency-based instruction, early practical exposure, regular readiness assessment, and enhanced housekeeping laboratory training are needed to improve students' preparedness for TESDA certification and future employment in the hospitality industry.

Keywords: competency-based education, Housekeeping NC II, hospitality management, student readiness, TESDA certification

INTRODUCTION

The hospitality and tourism industry remains one of the most important service sectors worldwide because of its contribution to economic growth, employment generation, and human resource development. As international tourism continues to recover from the disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, hospitality establishments increasingly require workers who are not only academically prepared but also technically competent, service-oriented, and adaptable to changing workplace demands. The World Travel & Tourism Council (WTTC, 2024) reported that travel and tourism continue to support millions of jobs globally, while UN Tourism (2025) noted

that international tourism has substantially recovered, with international tourist arrivals reaching approximately 1.4 billion in 2024. These developments suggest that hospitality education institutions must continue strengthening students' competencies to meet the demands of a recovering and increasingly competitive industry.

The post-pandemic hospitality environment has created new expectations for graduates entering the workforce. Hotels, resorts, restaurants, and other hospitality establishments now require employees who can demonstrate strong technical skills, sanitation awareness, communication ability, teamwork, customer service, and problem-solving. Baum, Mooney, Robinson, and Solnet (2020) emphasized that the pandemic exposed existing workforce vulnerabilities in hospitality, particularly in relation to skills development, labor preparedness, and employment stability. Sigala (2020) similarly argued that tourism and hospitality education must respond to industry transformation by preparing graduates for operational changes, digitalization, health and safety requirements, and new guest expectations. These changes highlight the need for hospitality management programs to provide learning experiences that go beyond classroom-based instruction.

Competency-based education has become an important approach in preparing students for industry practice because it focuses on the actual knowledge, skills, and attitudes that learners must demonstrate. Gervais (2016) described competency-based education as an outcome-based approach that emphasizes mastery of defined competencies through appropriate instruction and assessment. In higher education, however, Holmes, Tuin, and Turner (2021) cautioned that competence and competency must be clearly defined so that teachers and assessors can design appropriate learning outcomes and performance-based assessments. For hospitality management programs, this means that students should not only understand service concepts but should also be able to perform tasks according to industry standards.

Graduate employability is closely related to competency development. Employability refers not only to obtaining employment after graduation but also to possessing the skills, personal qualities, and professional behaviors needed to perform effectively in the workplace. Succi and Canovi (2020) found that employers place high importance on soft skills such as communication, teamwork, adaptability, and problem-solving, while Jackson and Bridgstock (2021) emphasized that curricular, co-curricular, extracurricular, and paid work experiences contribute to graduate employability. In hospitality education, these findings are important because the industry evaluates graduates based on both technical performance and service behavior. Thus, hospitality students must develop both hard skills and soft skills to become competitive in the labor market.

In the Philippines, hospitality management education is guided by outcomes-based education and competency-oriented standards. The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) issued CMO No. 62, series of 2017, which provides the policies, standards, and guidelines for the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management program. This policy emphasizes the development of graduates who can perform operational, supervisory, and managerial functions in the hospitality and tourism sectors (CHED, 2017). In addition, the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) provides national competency standards and certification systems that assess whether individuals can perform specific occupational tasks according to industry requirements. The connection between CHED outcomes-based education and TESDA competency assessment is important because both aim to strengthen the readiness and employability of Filipino graduates.

One of the most relevant certifications for hospitality management students is the Housekeeping National Certificate II (NC II). TESDA (2013) defines Housekeeping NC II as a qualification consisting of competencies required to prepare guest rooms, clean public areas and equipment, provide housekeeping services, provide valet service, handle guest concerns, and perform laundry-related tasks. The qualification is organized into Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies. Basic Competencies include workplace communication, teamwork, career professionalism, and occupational health and safety. Common Competencies include industry knowledge, workplace hygiene, computer operations, workplace safety practices, and customer service. Core Competencies focus on actual housekeeping tasks such as cleaning rooms, preparing rooms for incoming guests, providing housekeeping services, laundering linen and guest clothes, and cleaning public areas and equipment.

Housekeeping is a critical function in accommodation operations because it directly affects guest satisfaction, sanitation, safety, comfort, and the overall image of the establishment. Although housekeeping is sometimes viewed as a support service, it requires careful performance of technical and customer-related tasks. Housekeeping personnel must properly use cleaning tools, equipment, chemicals, linen supplies, and room service procedures while maintaining professional interaction with guests and coordination with other departments. For this reason, students preparing for Housekeeping NC II certification must be trained not only in theoretical concepts but also in hands-on skills and workplace behavior. Readiness for certification therefore becomes an important indicator of whether students are prepared to meet national competency standards and industry expectations.

Several studies have shown that hospitality graduates must possess a combination of technical competence, interpersonal skills, adaptability, and professionalism to succeed in the industry. Dzia-Uddin, Minghat, and Wan Zakaria (2023) reported that post-pandemic hospitality graduates need employability skills that include knowledge, skills, and attitudes suitable for changing hospitality environments. Pérez Zúñiga, Martínez García, and Oliva Ibarra (2025) also emphasized that employability in higher education is strengthened when teaching methodologies, assessment practices, and competency-based approaches are connected to real-world tasks. These findings support the need for hospitality programs to regularly assess whether students are ready to perform industry-related competencies before graduation or certification assessment.

Despite the importance of hospitality competencies, a gap remains between academic preparation and workplace expectations. Many hospitality programs include laboratory activities, practicum experiences, and industry immersion; however, students may still lack confidence or practical readiness for competency-based certification. This concern is especially important in Housekeeping NC II because the qualification requires actual performance of housekeeping tasks, not only knowledge of procedures. If students are not ready in Basic, Common, and Core Competencies, they may have difficulty passing the assessment and performing effectively in accommodation establishments. Therefore, assessing students' readiness before certification can help institutions identify competency gaps and design appropriate interventions.

Although previous studies have examined hospitality employability, internship performance, and general graduate competencies, limited studies have specifically assessed the readiness of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students for TESDA Housekeeping NC II certification using the three TESDA competency domains. This gap is significant because general employability does not always reflect readiness for a specific national certification. A student may be employable in a broad sense but may still be unprepared for the specific technical and practical requirements of Housekeeping NC II. Furthermore, there is limited evidence from Philippine state universities in developing provincial contexts, where hospitality programs play an important role in preparing graduates for local and regional tourism employment.

This study addresses this gap by assessing the readiness of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students at North Eastern Mindanao State University–Cagwait Campus for TESDA Housekeeping NC II certification. Specifically, the study aims to determine the demographic profile of the respondents; assess their level of readiness in terms of Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies; and determine whether significant differences exist in readiness when respondents are grouped according to sex, age, and year level. By focusing on these areas, the study provides evidence that may guide curriculum enhancement, skills training, laboratory instruction, and competency-based assessment in hospitality management education.

The study contributes to hospitality education by providing empirical information on students' readiness for a specific national certification. Its findings may help faculty members, program heads, curriculum planners, and institutional administrators strengthen the alignment between BSHM instruction and TESDA competency standards. The results may also support the development of early diagnostic assessments, simulation-based housekeeping training, enhanced laboratory activities, and industry-based learning experiences. Ultimately, assessing students' readiness for Housekeeping NC II certification is necessary to improve graduate preparedness, increase employability, and produce hospitality graduates who can meet the practical demands of the industry.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-comparative research design. The descriptive component was used to determine the demographic profile of the respondents and their level of readiness for TESDA Housekeeping NC II certification in terms of Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies. The comparative component was used to determine whether significant differences existed in students' readiness when grouped according to sex, age, and year level.

A quantitative design was appropriate because the study measured students' self-assessed readiness using numerical data and applied statistical procedures to compare readiness levels across demographic groups. Descriptive-comparative research is commonly used when the objective is to describe variables and examine group differences without manipulating the study environment (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Research Locale

The study was conducted at North Eastern Mindanao State University–Cagwait Campus, located in Cagwait, Surigao del Sur, Philippines. The campus offers the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management program, which prepares students for employment in hospitality, tourism, accommodation, and food service-related industries. The locale was selected because the study sought to generate empirical evidence that could support curriculum enhancement, competency-based instruction, and improved preparation of BSHM students for Housekeeping NC II certification.

Respondents of the Study

The respondents of the study were Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students enrolled at North Eastern Mindanao State University–Cagwait Campus. A total of 100 students participated in the study. The respondents were equally distributed across year levels, with 25 students from first year, 25 students from second year, 25 students from third year, and 25 students from fourth year.

The inclusion of students from different year levels allowed the researchers to assess readiness across stages of academic progression. This was important because students in higher year levels were expected to have greater exposure to hospitality-related courses, laboratory activities, practical training, and industry-based learning experiences compared with students in lower year levels.

Sampling Technique

The study used stratified random sampling. The BSHM student population was grouped according to year level, and respondents were selected from each stratum. Equal allocation was applied by selecting 25 respondents from each year level. This sampling technique ensured that all academic levels were represented and allowed meaningful comparison of readiness across year-level groups.

Stratified random sampling was appropriate because the study involved distinct student subgroups that may differ in academic exposure, maturity, and practical learning experience.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument used in the study was a structured survey questionnaire based on the competency domains of TESDA Housekeeping NC II. TESDA Housekeeping NC II identifies the Basic, Common, and Core Competencies required for housekeeping-related functions in accommodation establishments, including workplace communication, customer service, occupational safety and health, room preparation, laundry services, cleaning public areas, and providing housekeeping services to guests (Technical Education and Skills Development Authority [TESDA], 2013).

The questionnaire consisted of two main parts. The first part gathered the respondents' demographic profile in terms of age, sex, and year level. The second part assessed the respondents' readiness for Housekeeping NC II certification. The readiness items were organized according to the three competency domains.

Basic Competencies included items on workplace communication, teamwork, career professionalism, and occupational health and safety. Common Competencies included items on industry knowledge, workplace hygiene, computer operations, workplace safety practices, and customer service. Core Competencies included items on providing housekeeping services, cleaning and preparing rooms, providing valet or butler service, laundering linen and guest clothes, cleaning public areas and equipment, and handling intoxicated guests.

A five-point Likert scale was used to measure the respondents' level of readiness. Likert-type scales are widely used in survey research to measure respondents' attitudes, perceptions, and self-assessments through ordered response categories (Likert, 1932).

Scale	Range of Weighted Mean	Verbal Interpretation
5	4.01 – 5.00	Highly Ready
4	3.01 – 4.00	Ready
3	2.01 – 3.00	Somewhat Ready
2	1.01 – 2.00	Not Ready
1	0.00 – 1.00	Highly Not Ready

Validity of the Instrument

The survey questionnaire was adopted and modified from TESDA Housekeeping NC II competency standards to ensure alignment with the required competencies for certification. The instrument was reviewed by the research adviser and field experts to determine its content relevance, clarity, and appropriateness for the target respondents. Comments and suggestions from the validators were considered in improving the final version of the questionnaire before data collection.

This validation process helped ensure that the items were suitable for measuring students' readiness in terms of Basic, Common, and Core Competencies. It also strengthened the alignment between the instrument and the competency standards required for Housekeeping NC II certification.

Reliability of the Instrument

The internal consistency of the research instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha is commonly used to determine the extent to which items within a scale measure the same underlying construct (Cronbach, 1951; Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Reliability analysis was conducted separately for each competency domain and for the overall readiness scale.

The Basic Competencies domain, composed of 17 items, obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .86, indicating good reliability. The Common Competencies domain, composed of 22 items, obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .89, also indicating good reliability. The Core Competencies domain, composed of 23 items, obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .91, indicating excellent reliability. Overall, the 62-item readiness scale obtained a Cronbach's alpha of .94, indicating excellent reliability. These results show that the research instrument demonstrated a high level of internal consistency and was suitable for measuring the readiness of BSHM students for Housekeeping NC II certification.

Competency Domain	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Basic Competencies	17	.86	Good reliability
Common Competencies	22	.89	Good reliability
Core Competencies	23	.91	Excellent reliability
Overall Readiness Scale	62	.94	Excellent reliability

Data Gathering Procedure

Before the conduct of the study, the survey questionnaire was reviewed and validated by the research adviser and field experts. After validation, permission was secured to administer the questionnaire to the selected respondents. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants, including the voluntary nature of their participation and the confidentiality of their responses.

After obtaining consent, the researchers distributed the questionnaires to the selected BSHM students. The respondents were given sufficient time to answer the instrument. The completed questionnaires were retrieved, checked for completeness, encoded, tabulated, and analyzed according to the objectives of the study.

Ethical Considerations

The study observed ethical principles in conducting research involving student participants. Participation was voluntary, and the respondents were informed about the purpose of the study before answering the questionnaire. They were assured that their responses would remain confidential and would be used only for academic and research purposes. No personally identifying information was required in the final analysis. The researchers also ensured that no respondent was forced or pressured to participate.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, and year level. Mean and standard deviation were used to determine the level of readiness of BSHM students for Housekeeping NC II certification in terms of Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies.

An independent-samples t-test was used to determine whether a significant difference existed in readiness when respondents were grouped according to sex. One-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether significant differences existed in readiness when respondents were grouped according to age and year level. The level of significance was set at .05. A probability value less than .05 was interpreted as statistically significant.

Research Variables

The independent variables of the study were the demographic characteristics of the respondents, specifically sex, age, and year level. The dependent variable was the level of readiness for Housekeeping NC II certification, measured in terms of Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies.

The results of the study served as the basis for identifying areas for curriculum enhancement and strengthening competency-based training in the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management program.

RESULTS

This section presents the findings of the study based on the research objectives. Specifically, it discusses the demographic profile of the respondents, the level of readiness of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students for Housekeeping NC II certification, and the significant differences in readiness when respondents were grouped according to sex, age, and year level.

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, and year level.

Profile	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Age	17 – 19 years old	30	30%
	20 – 21 years old	35	35%

Sex	22 – 23 years old	12	12%
	24 years old and above	23	23%
	Female	50	50%
	Male	50	50%
Year Level	First Year	25	25%
	Second Year	25	25%
	Third Year	25	25%
	Fourth Year	25	25%
Total		100	100%

Table 1 shows that the largest group of respondents was composed of students aged 20–21 years old, with 35 respondents or 35% of the total sample. This was followed by students aged 17–19 years old, with 30 respondents or 30%. Meanwhile, 23 respondents or 23% were 24 years old and above, while 12 respondents or 12% were aged 22–23 years old.

In terms of sex, the respondents were equally distributed, with 50 female students and 50 male students. This equal distribution provided a balanced basis for comparing readiness according to sex. In terms of year level, the respondents were also equally distributed, with 25 students from each academic level. This ensured representation from first year to fourth year and allowed comparison of readiness across stages of academic progression.

Level of Readiness for Housekeeping NC II Certification

Table 2 presents the level of readiness of BSHM students for Housekeeping NC II certification in terms of Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies.

Table 2 Level of Readiness of BSHM Students for Housekeeping NC II Certification

Competency Domain	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Variance	Minimum	Maximum	Verbal Interpretation
Basic Competencies	100	1.64	0.327	0.107	1.06	3.88	Not Ready
Common Competencies	100	1.66	0.312	0.097	1.00	3.57	Not Ready
Core Competencies	100	1.67	0.346	0.120	1.00	4.00	Not Ready

Table 2 shows that the respondents were generally **Not Ready** for Housekeeping NC II certification across all three competency domains. Basic Competencies obtained a mean score of 1.64, Common Competencies obtained a mean score of 1.66, and Core Competencies obtained a mean score of 1.67. Although Core Competencies recorded the highest mean among the three domains, all mean scores remained within the Not Ready range.

The standard deviations ranged from 0.312 to 0.346, indicating relatively low variation in the respondents' self-assessed readiness. Common Competencies had the lowest standard deviation of 0.312, suggesting more consistent responses in this domain. Core Competencies had the highest standard deviation of 0.346, indicating slightly greater variation in students' perceived readiness in performing actual housekeeping-related tasks. Overall, the findings indicate that students perceived themselves as insufficiently prepared in Basic, Common, and Core Competencies required for Housekeeping NC II certification.

Significant Difference in Readiness When Grouped According to Sex

Table 3 Table 3 presents the results of the independent-samples *t*-test used to determine whether significant differences existed in readiness when respondents were grouped according to sex. Cohen's *d* was also reported to determine the practical significance of the observed differences.

Table 3 Significant Difference in Readiness When Grouped According to Sex

Competency Domain	Test Statistic	df	p-value	Effect Size	Interpretation	Decision
Basic Competencies	$t = -2.10$	98	.038	0.42	Small to moderate effect	Significant
Common Competencies	$t = -1.37$	98	.175	0.27	Small Effect	Not Significant
Core Competencies	$t = -1.81$	98	.074	0.36	Small Effect	Not Significant

Note. Significant at $p < .05$. Effect size was reported using Cohen's *d*. Values are approximate and were derived from the reported test statistics.

Table 3 shows that a statistically significant difference was found in Basic Competencies when respondents were grouped according to sex, $t(98) = -2.10$, $p = .038$, Cohen's $d = 0.42$. This indicates a small to moderate practical effect. Since the p-value is less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected for Basic Competencies. This suggests that male and female respondents differed significantly in their perceived readiness in Basic Competencies.

However, no statistically significant difference was found in Common Competencies, $t(98) = -1.37$, $p = .175$, Cohen's $d = 0.27$, and Core Competencies, $t(98) = -1.81$, $p = .074$, Cohen's $d = 0.36$. Since both p-values are greater than .05, the null hypothesis was retained for these two domains. This means that male and female respondents did not significantly differ in their perceived readiness in Common and Core Competencies.

Significant Difference in Readiness When Grouped According to Age

Table 4 presents the results of the one-way analysis of variance used to determine whether significant differences existed in readiness when respondents were grouped according to age. Partial eta squared was also reported to determine the practical significance of the observed differences.

Table 4 Significant Difference in Readiness When Grouped According to Age

Competency Domain	F-value	df1	df2	p-value	Effect Size	Interpretation	Decision
Basic Competencies	3.60	3	35.5	.023	.23	Large effect	Significant
Common Competencies	7.14	3	33.9	< .001	.39	Large effect	Significant
Core Competencies	9.18	3	33.7	< .001	.45	Large effect	Significant

Note. Significant at $p < .05$. Effect size was reported using approximate partial eta squared.

Table 4 shows that significant differences existed in all three competency domains when respondents were grouped according to age. Basic Competencies showed a significant difference, $F(3, 35.5) = 3.60$, $p = .023$, $\eta^2 = .23$. Common Competencies also showed a significant difference, $F(3, 33.9) = 7.14$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .39$. Similarly, Core Competencies showed a significant difference, $F(3, 33.7) = 9.18$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .45$. The effect sizes suggest that the observed age-related differences had large practical effects.

Since all p-values are less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected for all three competency domains. These findings indicate that students' perceived readiness for Housekeeping NC II certification significantly differed

across age groups. However, because post hoc comparisons were not included, the specific age groups responsible for the significant differences could not be identified.

Significant Difference in Readiness When Grouped According to Year Level

Table 5 presents the results of the one-way analysis of variance used to determine whether significant differences existed in readiness when respondents were grouped according to year level. Partial eta squared was also reported to determine the practical significance of the observed differences.

Table 5 Significant Difference in Readiness When Grouped According to Year Level

Competency Domain	F-value	df1	df2	p-value	Effect Size	Interpretation	Decision
Basic Competencies	6.09	3	48.0	.001	.28	Large effect	Significant
Common Competencies	10.19	3	50.3	< .001	.38	Large effect	Significant
Core Competencies	9.35	3	48.9	< .001	.36	Large effect	Significant

Note. Significant at $p < .05$. Effect size was reported using approximate partial eta squared.

Table 5 shows that significant differences existed in all three competency domains when respondents were grouped according to year level. Basic Competencies showed a significant difference, $F(3, 48.0) = 6.09$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2 = .28$. Common Competencies also showed a significant difference, $F(3, 50.3) = 10.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .38$. Core Competencies likewise showed a significant difference, $F(3, 48.9) = 9.35$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .36$. The effect sizes suggest that the observed year-level differences had large practical effects.

Since all p-values are less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected for all three competency domains. This indicates that students' perceived readiness for Housekeeping NC II certification significantly differed according to year level. However, because post hoc comparisons were not conducted, the specific year levels responsible for the significant differences could not be identified.

Effect sizes were included to supplement the significance tests and provide information on the practical importance of the observed differences. While p-values indicate whether the differences were statistically significant, effect sizes provide additional information about the magnitude of these differences. However, because post hoc comparisons and group mean comparisons were not included, the effect sizes should be interpreted as indicators of overall group differences rather than evidence identifying which specific groups differed from one another.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The findings revealed that BSHM students **perceived themselves as generally Not Ready** for Housekeeping NC II certification in terms of Basic, Common, and Core Competencies. Among the three domains, Core Competencies obtained the highest mean score, while Basic Competencies obtained the lowest mean score. However, all three competency domains remained within the Not Ready range, indicating low levels of self-assessed readiness across the measured competency areas.

The results also showed that perceived readiness differed significantly according to selected demographic characteristics. Sex showed a significant difference only in Basic Competencies, with a small to moderate effect size. Meanwhile, age and year level showed significant differences across all three competency domains, with large effect sizes. These findings suggest that demographic and academic characteristics may be associated with variations in students' self-perceived readiness for Housekeeping NC II certification.

However, the interpretation of these differences should be made cautiously because post hoc comparisons and group mean comparisons were not included. Therefore, while the results show that significant differences existed, they do not identify the specific age groups or year levels that differed from one another.

DISCUSSION

The findings revealed that Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students generally perceived themselves as **Not Ready** for TESDA Housekeeping NC II certification in terms of Basic Competencies, Common Competencies, and Core Competencies. This result is significant because Housekeeping NC II certification is competency-based and requires students to demonstrate practical skills, workplace behavior, and service-related competencies aligned with national industry standards. TESDA Housekeeping NC II identifies Basic, Common, and Core Competencies as essential areas for housekeeping-related work in accommodation establishments (Technical Education and Skills Development Authority [TESDA], 2013). Therefore, the low self-assessed readiness scores across all three domains suggest that students may require stronger preparation before undergoing national certification assessment.

The findings should be interpreted within the context of self-assessed readiness. The study did not measure actual TESDA Housekeeping NC II performance, practical demonstration scores, or certification results. Therefore, the findings indicate that students perceived themselves as not ready across Basic, Common, and Core Competencies, but they do not necessarily prove that students would fail or perform poorly in an actual competency assessment. This distinction is important because perceived readiness and demonstrated competence are related but not equivalent.

The low self-perceived readiness in Basic Competencies suggests that students may still need further development in foundational workplace skills such as communication, teamwork, career professionalism, and occupational health and safety. These competencies are important because they support effective performance in hospitality workplaces where employees are expected to interact with colleagues, follow procedures, observe safety standards, and maintain professional behavior. In competency-based education, learning outcomes should be clearly defined and assessed based on students' ability to demonstrate expected knowledge, skills, values, and behaviors (Gervais, 2016). Thus, the low perceived readiness in Basic Competencies may indicate the need for stronger integration of workplace communication, team-based learning, professionalism, and safety-related activities across hospitality subjects.

The findings also showed that students perceived themselves as not ready in Common Competencies. These competencies include industry knowledge, workplace hygiene, computer operations, workplace safety practices, and customer service. In hospitality education, these areas are essential because service quality depends not only on technical performance but also on hygiene, safety, guest interaction, and service responsiveness. Succi and Canovi (2020) emphasized that employers highly value soft skills such as communication, teamwork, adaptability, and problem-solving because these skills contribute to graduate employability. Similarly, Dzia-Uddin, Minghat, and Wan Zakaria (2023) reported that post-pandemic hospitality graduates need a combination of knowledge, technical skills, attitudes, and interpersonal competencies to remain employable in changing service environments. The low perceived readiness in Common Competencies therefore suggests that practical, customer-oriented, and workplace-based learning experiences may need further strengthening.

The low self-perceived readiness in Core Competencies is particularly important because these competencies directly represent the technical tasks required in Housekeeping NC II. These include providing housekeeping services to guests, cleaning and preparing rooms, providing valet or butler services, laundering linen and guest clothes, cleaning public areas and equipment, and handling guest-related concerns. Since these tasks require actual performance, classroom instruction alone may not be sufficient to develop confidence and readiness for certification. Jackson and Bridgstock (2021) found that employability is strengthened through curricular, co-curricular, extracurricular, and work-related experiences that allow students to develop skills, gain experience, and build employment readiness. For hospitality students, this suggests that laboratory activities, simulations, return demonstrations, practicum, and industry immersion may help improve technical readiness.

The overall low perceived readiness across all competency domains may indicate a possible gap between curriculum delivery and competency assessment requirements. Although the Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management program is guided by outcomes-based education, students may still require more structured

exposure to TESDA-based performance standards. CHED CMO No. 62, series of 2017, emphasizes the preparation of hospitality management graduates for operational, supervisory, and managerial functions in the hospitality and tourism sectors (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2017). However, achieving these outcomes requires continuous alignment among classroom instruction, laboratory training, industry exposure, and national competency standards. Since this study did not directly measure curriculum delivery, instructional quality, laboratory exposure, or practicum experience, this interpretation should be understood as a possible explanation rather than a confirmed cause of students' low perceived readiness.

The significant difference in Basic Competency readiness when respondents were grouped according to sex indicates that male and female students differed in their self-assessed readiness in foundational workplace competencies. However, no significant differences were found in Common and Core Competencies according to sex. This suggests that sex may be associated with differences in students' perceived readiness in basic workplace skills, but not necessarily in service-oriented and technical housekeeping competencies. This finding should be interpreted cautiously because the available results do not include group means showing which group had higher readiness. Nevertheless, the result implies that instructional strategies for Basic Competencies should be inclusive and should provide equal opportunities for all students to practice communication, teamwork, professionalism, and workplace safety.

The significant differences found according to age and year level suggest that perceived readiness varied across student groups. However, because post hoc analyses and group mean comparisons were not included, the specific age groups or year levels responsible for these differences cannot be identified. Therefore, the results should not be interpreted as evidence that one specific group is more prepared than another unless further statistical analysis is conducted. Rather, the findings indicate that age and year level are associated with variations in perceived readiness and may be considered in designing readiness interventions.

The significant differences in readiness when respondents were grouped according to age may be related to differences in maturity, academic experience, confidence, or exposure to practical learning activities. However, since these factors were not directly measured in the study, they should be considered possible explanations rather than established conclusions. Despite this limitation, the finding suggests that readiness interventions may need to consider students' developmental and experiential differences. Younger students may benefit from earlier exposure to housekeeping tasks, while older students may need more advanced competency reinforcement before certification.

The significant differences in readiness according to year level also suggest that academic progression may be related to students' perceived preparedness. Students in higher academic levels are generally expected to have greater exposure to hospitality courses, laboratory activities, practical assessments, and industry-based experiences. However, as with age, the absence of group mean scores and post hoc comparisons limits the interpretation of which specific year levels had higher or lower readiness. Still, the significant ANOVA results indicate that perceived readiness is not uniform across academic levels. This supports the need for a scaffolded competency development plan in which Housekeeping NC II competencies are introduced early, reinforced progressively, and assessed continuously from first year to fourth year.

The recommendations for curriculum enhancement, laboratory reinforcement, mock assessment, and industry immersion should be understood as evidence-informed implications rather than direct causal conclusions. The study did not directly measure laboratory exposure, practicum quality, instructional methods, or availability of facilities. Nevertheless, because the readiness items were aligned with TESDA Housekeeping NC II competencies, the findings provide useful preliminary evidence that the program may benefit from stronger competency-based monitoring, practical training opportunities, and structured readiness assessment before students undergo certification.

The findings have important implications for curriculum enhancement. First, Housekeeping NC II competencies may be mapped more clearly across the BSHM curriculum to determine where Basic, Common, and Core Competencies are introduced, practiced, and assessed. Second, laboratory instruction may be strengthened to

ensure that students regularly perform housekeeping-related tasks rather than merely study the procedures. Third, diagnostic readiness assessments may be administered before students undergo TESDA assessment to identify competency gaps early. Fourth, simulation-based activities, mock competency assessments, role-playing, return demonstrations, and industry immersion may help students build confidence and technical proficiency. These strategies are consistent with competency-based education because they require students to demonstrate skills in realistic contexts (Gervais, 2016; Holmes et al., 2021).

The results also highlight the potential value of stronger collaboration among higher education institutions, TESDA-accredited assessment centers, and hospitality industry partners. Housekeeping competencies are practical and workplace-based; therefore, students may benefit from exposure to actual accommodation settings. Baum, Mooney, Robinson, and Solnet (2020) emphasized that hospitality workforce challenges require renewed attention to labor preparedness and skills development. Similarly, Sigala (2020) argued that hospitality and tourism education must respond to changing industry demands after the pandemic. For BSHM programs, this means that certification readiness may be treated as part of employability preparation rather than as a separate requirement.

Overall, the study indicates that BSHM students perceived themselves as needing stronger preparation for Housekeeping NC II certification. The finding that students reported low readiness across Basic, Common, and Core Competencies suggests the need for systematic curriculum review, improved practical training opportunities, and more frequent competency-based assessments. The significant differences according to sex, age, and year level further suggest that perceived readiness may be associated with demographic and academic factors. By addressing these areas through evidence-informed interventions, the institution may better support students' certification preparation, improve employability readiness, and contribute to the development of hospitality graduates who are more prepared to meet national and industry standards.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the study measured students' **self-perceived readiness** for TESDA Housekeeping NC II certification rather than their objectively demonstrated competency. Although self-assessment provides useful information about students' confidence and perceived preparedness, it may not accurately reflect actual performance in practical housekeeping tasks or in a formal TESDA competency assessment. Students may either overestimate or underestimate their readiness. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as evidence of perceived readiness rather than confirmed certification competence.

Second, the study did not include actual TESDA Housekeeping NC II examination results, mock assessment scores, laboratory performance ratings, or assessor-based evaluations. As a result, the study cannot determine whether students who rated themselves as not ready would also perform poorly in actual competency assessment. Future studies should combine self-assessment questionnaires with objective measures such as practical performance assessments, mock TESDA evaluations, laboratory observations, assessor feedback, or actual Housekeeping NC II certification outcomes.

Third, although significant differences were found when students were grouped according to age and year level, the study did not report post hoc comparisons or group mean comparisons. This limits the interpretation of the ANOVA results because the specific age groups and year levels responsible for the significant differences could not be identified. Future analyses should include post hoc tests, such as Tukey HSD or Games-Howell, depending on the equality of variance assumption, to provide more detailed interpretation of group differences.

Fourth, the study was conducted in only one state university with a sample of 100 BSHM students. Although stratified random sampling ensured representation across year levels within the institution, the findings cannot be generalized to all hospitality management students in the Philippines. Other universities and colleges may differ in curriculum structure, laboratory facilities, faculty expertise, industry partnerships, and access to TESDA

assessment preparation. Future research should involve multiple higher education institutions across different regions to improve external validity and allow comparative analysis between public and private institutions.

Fifth, the study did not directly measure possible factors influencing readiness, such as laboratory exposure, practicum experience, prior housekeeping training, quality of instruction, availability of facilities, or industry immersion. Therefore, explanations related to curriculum enhancement, laboratory training, and practical exposure should be interpreted as evidence-informed implications rather than direct causal conclusions. Future studies may use longitudinal or mixed-method designs to examine how specific educational interventions influence students' certification readiness over time.

Finally, future research may incorporate qualitative methods such as interviews, focus group discussions, reflective journals, and feedback from TESDA assessors or hospitality industry supervisors. These approaches may provide deeper insight into the reasons behind students' low perceived readiness and support the development of more targeted curriculum improvements in hospitality management education.

CONCLUSION

This study assessed the self-perceived readiness of Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management students for TESDA Housekeeping NC II certification in terms of Basic, Common, and Core Competencies. The findings showed that students perceived themselves as generally Not Ready across all three competency domains. This indicates that, based on their self-assessments, respondents may require further preparation before undergoing national competency assessment.

The study also found statistically significant differences in perceived readiness according to selected demographic characteristics. Sex was associated with a significant difference only in Basic Competencies, while age and year level showed significant differences across Basic, Common, and Core Competencies. The reported effect sizes suggest that some of these differences may have practical relevance. However, because post hoc comparisons and group mean comparisons were not included, the specific groups responsible for these differences could not be identified.

The conclusions of the study should be interpreted cautiously because readiness was measured through students' self-assessed perceptions rather than objective competency assessment, mock TESDA evaluation, laboratory observation, or actual certification results. Thus, the findings reflect perceived readiness rather than confirmed demonstrated competence. Nevertheless, the study provides useful preliminary evidence for curriculum review, competency-based monitoring, and the strengthening of practical preparation for Housekeeping NC II certification.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the Hospitality Management program may strengthen the alignment of its curriculum with TESDA Housekeeping NC II competency standards by clearly mapping Basic, Common, and Core Competencies across relevant courses and laboratory activities.

The program may conduct regular diagnostic readiness assessments, mock TESDA evaluations, return demonstrations, and simulation-based housekeeping activities to help students identify competency gaps before actual certification assessment.

Housekeeping laboratory instruction may be enhanced by providing more frequent hands-on practice in room preparation, cleaning procedures, laundry operations, guest service, workplace hygiene, occupational safety, and related core housekeeping tasks.

The institution may strengthen partnerships with TESDA-accredited assessment centers and hospitality industry partners to provide students with exposure to actual housekeeping standards, workplace expectations, and

assessor-based feedback.

Future studies should complement self-assessment questionnaires with objective measures such as practical performance assessments, laboratory observations, mock certification results, actual Housekeeping NC II assessment outcomes, and assessor feedback. Future research may also include post hoc analyses, group mean comparisons, and multi-institutional samples to provide a more detailed and generalizable understanding of certification readiness.

Ethical Approval Statement

The study was conducted in accordance with basic ethical principles for research involving human participants. Permission to administer the survey was secured from the appropriate institutional authorities. The respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, and the confidentiality of their responses. No personally identifying information was included in the final analysis.

Conflict Of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest related to the conduct, analysis, interpretation, or publication of this study.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to institutional guidelines and privacy considerations.

REFERENCES

1. Baum, T., Mooney, S. K. K., Robinson, R. N. S., & Solnet, D. (2020). COVID-19's impact on the hospitality workforce—New crisis or amplification of the norm? *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 32(9), 2813–2829. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-04-2020-0314>
2. Commission on Higher Education. (2017). CMO No. 62, series of 2017: Policies, standards and guidelines for Bachelor of Science in Tourism Management and Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management. Commission on Higher Education.
3. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297–334. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02310555>
5. Dzia-Uddin, D. N., Minghat, A. D., & Wan Zakaria, W. N. (2023). Systematic literature review of employability skills of hospitality graduates after COVID-19 era. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(10), 2155–2175. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i10/19116>
6. Gervais, J. (2016). The operational definition of competency-based education. *The Journal of Competency-Based Education*, 1(2), 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbe2.1011>
7. Holmes, A. G. D., Tuin, M. P., & Turner, S. L. (2021). Competence and competency in higher education, simple terms yet with complex meanings: Theoretical and practical issues for university teachers and assessors implementing competency-based education. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 10(3), 39–52. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2021.103.3>
8. Jackson, D., & Bridgstock, R. (2021). What actually works to enhance graduate employability? The relative value of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular learning and paid work. *Higher Education*, 81(4), 723–739. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00570-x>
9. Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1–55.
10. Pérez Zúñiga, R., Martínez García, M., & Oliva Ibarra, F. E. (2025). Employability and its relationship with the competency-based approach, teaching methodologies, and assessment in higher education: A

- systematic review. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1703144. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1703144>
11. Sigala, M. (2020). Tourism and COVID-19: Impacts and implications for advancing and resetting industry and research. *Journal of Business Research*, 117, 312–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.015>
12. Succi, C., & Canovi, M. (2020). Soft skills to enhance graduate employability: Comparing students' and employers' perceptions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(9), 1834–1847. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1585420>
13. Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education*, 2, 53–55. <https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd>
14. Technical Education and Skills Development Authority. (2013). Training regulations for Housekeeping NC II. TESDA.
15. UN Tourism. (2025). World Tourism Barometer and Statistical Annex, January 2025. UN Tourism.
16. World Travel & Tourism Council. (2024). Travel & tourism economic impact 2024: Global trends. World Travel & Tourism Council.