International Research Journal of Multidisciplinary Scope (IRJMS), 2026; 7(1): 769-784

Original Article | ISSN (O): 2582-631X DOI: 10.47857/irjms.2026.v07i01.07689

Work Readiness and the Quality of Mindset of the Fourth Year Students in a State University

Maria Jennifer G Cubillo[1*], Melona C Deguma[2], Vicente J Igot[2], Reylan G Capuno[2]

[1]General Education Department, College Teacher Education, Bohol Island State University, Bohol, Philippines, [2]College of Education-Graduate Teacher Education, Cebu Technological University, Cebu City, 600, Philippines. *Corresponding Author's Email: mariajennifer.cubillo@bisu.edu.ph

Abstract

This study examined the work readiness and mindset quality of fourth-year students a0t a state university during the academic year 2024–2025. It employed a descriptive-correlational design to examine the students' demographics, their degree of work readiness, their mindset type, and the interrelations among these variables. We used a self-made questionnaire and adapted tools based on mindset to collect data from 319 students at Bohol Island State University. The data were arranged, condensed, and examined without altering any variables. The results indicated that most of the students were the right age for their level and finished their course in four years. The majority was female, resided with both parents in small households, and their parents possessed limited educational qualifications. Students were ready to work. They had better interpersonal skills than communication or technical skills. The majority of students possessed a growth mindset, holding the belief that they could enhance their skills and intelligence through diligence and education. The study revealed a weak correlation between mindset and work readiness, implying that mindset alone is not sufficient to determine work readiness. The study suggested making a career plan and training modules that focus on real-world skills, job simulations, learning about industry standards, and workshops on resilience, emotional intelligence, and leadership to help students grow and change their minds.

Keywords: Career Preparedness, Fixed Mindset, Growth Mindset, Respondents.

Introduction

New graduates' readiness for work is a good sign of their future success (1). Even though it's important, a lot of graduating students don't know how to prepare for work. They must learn to do their jobs and get along with others to develop the personal traits they need to succeed as new graduates (2). The World Economic Forum says that inflation, rising costs of living, and job insecurity are some of the most significant problems in today's fast-changing job market that make people less ready for work. In today's highly competitive job market, candidates must now have good communication skills, be good with technology, be able to work well with others, and learn and understand the world of work. It is found from the past research that those from poorer countries have many problems, such as not being able to get enough training and not having enough social protection (3). Employers are putting more and more value on practical skills and being ready to work than on academic qualifications. They look for traits like perseverance, the ability to adapt to the culture of the workplace, and interpersonal skills when hiring. These skills are essential for graduates to be successful in today's complicated job market (4). The study shows that employers and employees in the area don't often agree on what skills will be needed in a changing job market or the best ways to develop them. Employer expectations and employee perceptions regarding the most essential skills often diverge significantly (5). Graduates from provincial state universities have their set of problems and challenges. Many graduates from provincial state universities don't know what employers want because they lack opportunities for hands-on training, internships, or applying their knowledge in real-life situations. This lack of experience often makes people less confident and makes them feel like they aren't ready for the demands of the job. Moreover, the correlation between student engagement and work readiness among 565 college students

(Received 19th August 2025; Accepted 24th December 2025; Published 22nd January 2026)

illustrated that individual background factors can markedly affect students' preparedness for employment. The study incorporated demographic variables, including sex, paid work experience, and college units, as control variables to mitigate potential disparities in students' exposure, motivation, and skill development. The findings indicated that, even after accounting for these variables, student engagement continued to be a significant predictor of work readiness, meaning that it's worth evaluating both personal characteristics and psychological attributes in assessing preparedness for employment (6).

Another important problem is that graduates don't have enough soft skills. Employers often say that new hires don't have the important skills that are becoming more important in today's workplaces, like being able to communicate eloquently, adapt, think critically, and solve problems. Rural graduates have it worse because they must move to cities with no local industries that match their skills. This change can be challenging in its own right, as people worry about leaving their families and familiar places, getting used to city life, and getting over their fear of failing in new situations (7).

The level of satisfaction with academic life predicts how ready new graduates are to work. Our research indicates that students' mindsets, including their interpersonal abilities, communication skills, and orientation towards growth, significantly influence their preparedness for professional employment. This data shows how important it is to use holistic approaches that address both attitudes and skills (8). Exit interviews with graduating students at the state university provide further understanding of their challenges. Many reports feel unprepared for jobs outside their field, and some are worried about meeting family expectations while becoming adults. Many people find it challenging to be financially independent and make important decisions, especially those who grew up in rural areas (9). A tracer study conducted by the Alumni Office underscores these challenges, revealing that only 60% of graduates obtained employment within two years of graduation, and among those employed, 67.86% were engaged in fields unrelated to their specialization. This gap between what students learn in school and what they need to know for work shows that we need to do more to get students ready for the job market. Furthermore, the way graduating students think is crucial for how well they can adjust to new work environments. To endure through tough times, you need to be resilient, persistent, and adaptable and have a growth-oriented mindset. This requirement is especially true in the job market, which is constantly changing and full of uncertainty. But many students show signs of anxiety and low self-esteem, which may be because they weren't prepared well enough and didn't have enough experience with real-world expectations (10).

Mindset has also become an important factor in determining how ready someone is for a career. Students' perceptions of intelligence, often viewed as an unlikely growth mindset, significantly influence their cognition, conduct, and academic achievement (11). A study found that people's mindsets can affect how they react to unrelated situations (12). This distinction underscores the impact of these mindsets on learning, resilience, and achievement. Mindset is a motivational framework that influences how people see and confront problems, which has a direct effect on their learning and performance at work (13). Holland's most important contribution to career development is the RIASEC model, which is a theory of vocational personalities and work environments. Most people have traits that fit into a mix of six personality types: Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional. Certain interests, skills, values, and personal traits make up each type (14). Roe's personality theory demonstrates that when parents adopt a nurturing and democratic parenting approach, providing emotional support and autonomy, it facilitates the development of children's distinct needs and values. Consequently, these children often make more informed and broader career decisions that correspond with their identity and ambitions (15). Choosing a career is not something that happens all at once; it is a process that happens over the course of a lifetime and has five stages: growth, exploration, establishment, maintenance, and decline. Each stage necessitates specific actions. For example, in childhood, you need to develop your interests; in adolescence, you need to explore your options; and in adulthood, you need to keep or change your career (16).

The goal of this study is to find out how ready and mentally prepared fourth-year students at a state university in Bohol province are to work during the school year 2024–2025. The goal is to find out what factors affect their readiness for future jobs and what gaps need to be filled.

This study primarily offers an empirical contribution by investigating work readiness and mindset among fourth-year students at a state university in Bohol, a demographic that has been underrepresented in previous research. It conceptually integrates work readiness and mindset, enhancing our understanding of their interrelation within a local context. Although no novel measurement or methodology was introduced, the findings provide foundational data that can guide subsequent studies and interventions designed to improve student readiness for the workforce. The results will be used to create a complete guidance intervention program that will help students get ready for professional life by closing the gap between what they learn in school and what employers want.

Methodology

Research Design

This quantitative study employed a descriptive-correlational research design to assess the work readiness and quality of mindset among fourth-year students in Bohol province for the academic year 2024-2025. Descriptive research facilitates the systematic observation and documentation of facts and essential insights regarding individuals' experiences. Moreover, the correlational design enabled the examination of the relationship between work readiness and mindset quality without altering the variables; this methodological framework guaranteed a thorough comprehension of the variables while preserving the authenticity of natural conditions (17-19). This study evaluated work preparedness utilizing a validated self-report instrument. The instrument assessed essential domains of work readiness, including interpersonal foundations, communication foundations, and personal work habits, utilizing Likert-type items adapted from recognized work readiness frameworks. The scale has been utilized in higher education contexts and exhibited satisfactory reliability in this study. No performance tasks or employer evaluations were employed, as the emphasis was on students' perceived readiness in relation to their academic and field-training experiences.

The study utilized a cross-sectional design, limiting causal inference and allowing for the possibility of reverse causation; specifically, students exhibiting higher work readiness may also be more predisposed to perceive themselves as possessing a stronger growth mindset. Even though factors like the academic year and job-search engagement were statistically controlled, it is not possible to definitively determine the directional influence between the variables.

Sampling

The study's participants were all fourth-year students at the university. They were chosen because they are preparing for their careers after graduation as future professionals. They are expected to use the skills and knowledge they gained in school in their chosen fields. A total of 319 people were chosen to answer the survey questionnaire using universal sampling. There were 59 students in the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science program, 40 in the Bachelor of Science in Environmental Science program, 74 in the Bachelor of Science in Hotel Management program, 51 in the Bachelor of Elementary Education program, 30 in the Bachelor of Secondary Education program with a major in Mathematics, and 65 in the Bachelor of Technology and Livelihood Education program.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher used a three-part tool to obtain the data they needed. The first part asked questions about the respondents' profiles, such as their age, gender, living situation, number of siblings, and the highest level of education their parents had. The second part, a self-made, copyrighted questionnaire (Certificate No. 2025-00792-A), assessed the work readiness of fourth-year students. An extensive review of pertinent literature and the study's conceptual framework informed the development of this tool. It had a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher, with 0.60 being the lowest acceptable level. It also had an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.99, which indicates that it was very consistent internally. Three registered guidance counselors and one psychologist from different state universities served as expert validators to verify that the instrument was valid. It also went through statistical testing and a pilot test with 582 people

from three universities to ensure that it was clear, reliable, and useful. The third part featured questions "adapted from Dweck's Mindset Instrument" (20). The tool's author granted permission for its use prior to its distribution. After obtaining permission to conduct the study, the researcher collaborated with the fourth-year students to devise a plan for data collection. On the agreed date, the participants were told what the study was about, how it would be done, and what steps would be taken to keep their information private. Before the questionnaires were given out, everyone gave their informed consent. There were clear instructions on how to answer, and enough time and help were given to finish. After they were done, the questionnaires were gathered, sorted, counted, and put together. We used the right statistical tools to look at and make sense of the data. The last part of the study was to create an output based on the results, which led to a suggested intervention program to meet the needs of the university's fourth-year students.

Data Analysis

A statistician helped organize and analyze the data after it was collected. We used percentages and frequency counts to describe the respondents' profiles, such as their age, gender, where they lived, how many siblings they had, and how much education their parents had. We used the weighted mean and standard deviation to assess the respondents' work readiness and mindset. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to look at the link between the respondents' work readiness and their mindset. This statistical analysis helped evaluate the existence of a significant relationship between the two variables.

Results and Discussion

The results and findings based on the data gathered are presented below:

Profile of the Respondents

This data highlights the age and gender distribution of the respondents. Table 1 The demographic profile of the respondents, including age, and gender. show that the majority of respondents were aged 21–22 years (80.56%), reflecting the typical age range of graduating students. Most were female (74.92%)**,** consistent with the gender distribution commonly observed in education programs. Only small proportions were aged 23–24 (13.48%) or 19–20 (3.76%), and very few were 25 and above (2.19%). This demographic profile suggests a predominantly young, female cohort nearing graduation.

Table 1: Age and Gender of the Respondents

Age (in years)	Female		Male		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
25 and above	4	1.25	3	0.94	7	2.19
23-24	29	9.09	14	4.39	43	13.48
21-22	197	61.76	60	18.81	257	80.56
19-20	9	2.82	3	0.94	12	3.76
Total	239	74.92	80	25.08	319	100.00

The outcomes indicated that a greater proportion of female respondents signifies more extensive enrollment trends, wherein women frequently engage in higher education more proactively than men. The cultural and societal factors contribute to the perception of education as a means of women's empowerment. The majority of students are between the ages of 21 and 22, which is in line with the typical age range of fourth-year students in the Philippine educational system, especially in state universities. Furthermore, this age was the usual time for moving from school to work. At this age, the students were focused on learning the skills and knowledge they would need for their future jobs. This means that being ready to work may be very similar to what employers expect from new graduates, and it could also affect how they think.

A study indicates that younger students, especially those under 25, exhibit a greater receptiveness to growth-oriented mindsets, which correlates with preparedness for career challenges. Female students, who often outperform male peers in higher education, exhibit a heightened inclination towards adopting growth mindsets, which is positively associated with workplace readiness (21).

Table 2: Persons Whom the Respondents Live with

Persons whom they live with	F	%
Living with both parents	244	76.49
Living with siblings	3	0.94
Living with guardian	12	3.76
Living with grandparents	8	2.51
Living with a partner	4	1.25
Living with Uncle/Aunt	4	1.25
Living with single-parent	41	12.85
Living alone	3	0.94
Total	319	100.00

Person Whom the Respondents Live With

The data on the persons with whom the respondents lived were computed using frequency counts and percentages. Table 2 shows that 76.49% of the people who answered (244) live with both parents. This suggests that their family structure is generally stable, which is likely to help them emotionally and academically. Students who live with only one parent come in second. The result is a significant group whose family situation may affect their mindset and readiness to work. Only a small number of respondents (0.94%, or 3) live alone or with siblings, which suggests that only a few students are fully independent. The majority of students living with both parents corresponds with research that associates stable home environments with reduced stress, improved academic concentration, and increased preparedness for employment (22, 23).

Number of Siblings of the Respondents

The data on the number of siblings of the respondents were computed using frequency counts and percentages.

Table 3: Number of Siblings of the Respondents

Number of Siblings	F	%
7 and above	47	14.73
4-6	122	38.24
1-3	145	45.45
None	5	1.57
Total	319	100.00

Table 3 shows that most respondents (45.45%, or 145 students) have one to three siblings, indicating smaller sibling groups. Students with four to six siblings constitute the second largest group after this one. Only 1.57% (5 students) are only children, meaning most of them get parental attention without sibling issues. The other respondents come from bigger families, which indicate that there are different types of families in the population. The sibling dynamics shown in this data have a big effect on how the respondent thinks and how ready they are to achieve a balance between shared parental resources and chances to improve their social and interpersonal skills through daily family interactions. This can help people learn how to work together, be strong, and solve problems, all of which are important skills for the future workplace. The dynamics of this family, especially how siblings get along, affect how students think and how they get along with others.

Table 4: Parents' Highest Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Mother		Father	
	F	%	F	%
Master's Degree	0	0.00	1	0.31
Bachelor's Degree	27	8.46	24	7.52
Some College	46	14.42	51	15.99
High School	142	44.51	105	32.92
Primary School	93	29.15	119	37.30
No Formal Education	9	2.82	10	3.13
Others	2	0.63	9	2.82
Total	319	100.00	319	100.00

The study examines the influence of family size on resource distribution within families, including financial investment and parental attention, which subsequently impact educational outcomes. The results indicate that children from larger families often receive fewer resources, potentially impacting their academic and social development. This limitation of resources may elucidate disparities in academic and occupational preparedness among students from diverse family sizes (24).

Parents' Highest Educational Attainment

The data on the parents' highest educational attainment of the respondents were computed using frequency counts and percentages.

Table 4 shows what the parents learned in school. The data indicate that the majority of mothers (44.51%) and fathers (32.92%) finished high school, and a significant percentage also achieved primary education (29.15% of mothers and 37.30% of fathers). A small number of people went to college. Only 8.46% of mothers and 7.52% of fathers had a bachelor's degree. Even fewer went on to obtain a master's degree (0% of mothers and 0.31% of fathers). A small number of parents said they had no formal education or were put in the "others" category. The results indicate that most parents have basic to intermediate levels of education. This situation could affect the students' academic support and career development. The respondents' parents' lack of formal education may affect the home environment in terms of how much academic help and encouragement is available. Parents may encounter difficulties delivering targeted academic guidance or cultivating a mindset oriented toward higher education and career readiness.

There are significant links between the education level of parents, their socioeconomic status, and the growth of their children. Students whose parents possessed advanced educational qualifications consistently attained superior grades and test scores. Parents who are educated also tend to be better at helping their kids learn at home. Their socio-economic status also influences this relationship. Families with higher socioeconomic status—often linked to parental education—offered better learning environments, such as access to resources and extracurricular activities (25).

The Work Readiness of the Respondents

This portion presents the work readiness of the respondents in terms of professional foundations, communication foundation, interpersonal foundation, ethical foundations and socio-cultural foundations.

Professional Foundation

The data on the level of work readiness of the respondents in terms of professional foundation were computed using weighted mean (WM) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 5 shows how ready the respondents are to work based on their professional foundation. The weighted means for all indicators were between 2.69 and 3.00, which is in the range of Moderately Competent. The highest mean score (WM = 3.00) was for the ability to use practical skills and knowledge in their area of expertise. The lowest mean score (WM = 2.69) was for the ability to explain difficult topics in related fields. The overall weighted mean of 2.82 (SD = 0.69) shows that most respondents think they are somewhat prepared in important professional skills like communication, planning, supervision, critical thinking, and putting theoretical ideas into practice. To fill these gaps, we need to quickly begin implementing targeted interventions that will help students build a strong professional foundation. The university can create full programs that include field-based training, which lets students gain real-world experience.

Encouraging students to actively participate in seminars, research projects, and group discussions can also help them practice how to present and explain their ideas clearly. These kinds of programs would help them learn more about technology, boost their confidence, and strengthen their communication skills, all of which would help them do better in their chosen careers.

The study indicates that field-based learning could greatly improve the quality of education in colleges and universities by helping students become more skilled and self-assured professionals. It urges schools to use new teaching methods to keep up with the changing needs of the workforce (26).

In terms of Communication Foundation

The data on the level of work readiness of the respondents in terms of communication foundation were computed using weighted mean (WM) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 5: Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents in Terms of Professional Foundation

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	I am confident in my ability to contribute to discussions & opportunities/ possibilities in several disciplines	2.87	0.69	Moderately Competent
2	I can demonstrate my confidence in discussing planning skills relevant to my chosen career.	2.78	0.65	Moderately Competent
3	I can engage in customer-oriented and business management skills emerging from using technology in my field.	2.75	0.69	Moderately Competent
4	I can promote the use of innovative working techniques & enhance productivity.	2.85	0.69	Moderately Competent
5	I can organize and supervise people in the execution of activities.	2.83	0.71	Moderately Competent
6	I am capable of explaining complex topics in related fields of specialization.	2.69	0.71	Moderately Competent
7	I can work with less supervision.	2.81	0.74	Moderately Competent
8	I can connect experiences and theories applications for my personal development.	2.87	0.67	Moderately Competent
9	I can critically analyze and evaluate the implications of recent research on my field of practice.	2.76	0.68	Moderately Competent
10	I am able to apply practical skills and knowledge in my field of specialization.	3.00	0.70	Moderately Competent
Aggregate Weighted Mean	2.82		Moderately Competent	
Aggregate Standard Deviation		0.69		

Legend:3.25-4.00-High; 2.50-3.24-Moderately Competent; 1.75-2.49-Slightly Competent; 1.00-1.74-Not At All Competent

Table 6: Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents in Terms of Communication Foundation

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	I am fluent in oral communication in both English and Filipino.	2.54	0.73	Moderately Competent
2	I can communicate fluently in written English and Filipino.	2.69	0.68	Moderately Competent
3	I have clear and coherent oral communication abilities in both English and Filipino.	2.56	0.69	Moderately Competent
4	I have excellent grammar and vocabulary skills in both English and Filipino writing.	2.45	0.72	Slightly Competent
5	I can modify my communication style in both languages for diverse audiences.	2.58	0.74	Moderately Competent
6	I can demonstrate active listening skills in conversations in both English and Filipino.	2.77	0.71	Moderately Competent
7	I can provide adequate verbal cues during conversation in both English and Filipino.	2.55	0.74	Moderately Competent
8	I can demonstrate cultural awareness in their spoken and written communication in English and Filipino.	2.65	0.72	Moderately Competent
9	I can use visual aids effectively to improve presentations in both English and Filipino.	2.78	0.80	Moderately Competent
10	I can assess and analyze written works in both English and Filipino.	2.77	0.74	Moderately Competent
	Aggregate Weighted Mean	2.64		Moderately Competent
	Aggregate Standard Deviation		0.73	

Table 6 shows how ready the respondents were to work based on their communication skills. The weighted means go from 2.45 to 2.78, and most of the indicators are in the moderately competent range. The mean score for grammar and vocabulary skills is the lowest (WM = 2.45), which means this is a weak point. The highest means (WM = 2.77–2.78) were seen in active listening, analyzing written works, and using visual aids in presentations. The overall moderately competent level in communication skills in both English and Filipino is shown by the weighted mean of 2.64 (SD = 0.73). The results have important effects on both academic programs and how ready people are to work. The respondents' limited grammar and vocabulary skills show that they need specific help,

like writing workshops, language improvement classes, and chances to work on writing projects with peers. It is advantageous to be able to use visual aids well, but to meet professional standards; you should also have a strong foundation in written communication. Employers want good communicators, both in writing and in person, as it's vital for success. Filling in these gaps will help students meet the needs of the job market and make them more ready for work in general. Knowledge of language is the basic fuel that lets people use it to communicate effectively. When learning a foreign language, students can't have meaningful conversations unless they know a lot about the language's parts. It is important to know vocabulary and grammar well because these things help students say what they mean (27).

In terms of Interpersonal foundation

The data on the level of work readiness of the respondents in terms of interpersonal foundation were computed using weighted mean (WM) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 7 shows that the average weighted mean of 2.94 indicates that the people who answered the question are moderately competent in interpersonal foundations. Students said they were very involved in group settings, especially when it came to valuing different points of view (WM = 3.12) and hearing what others had to say (WM = 3.10). They are also good at working with people from different fields (WM = 3.06) and taking care of their tasks in multidisciplinary teams (WM = 2.93). However, the lower means for starting leadership roles (WM = 2.73) and combining knowledge from different fields (WM = 2.84) indicate that there is still room for improvement in interpersonal skills. In general, the results show that students are adept at working in teams, being flexible, and communicating with people from other cultures. However, there is still room for improvement in proactive leadership and interdisciplinary integration.

The results show that we need to teach students to be leaders and proactive in groups. The school plans group projects and after-school activities that encourage students to take on leadership roles. This can help them feel more confident and open-minded about different cultural points of view, which can be strength in a globalized workplace. By developing these skills, students can become more competitive in the job market and be ready to meet the demands of the workplace as flexible team players and confident leaders. The research correlates work readiness with interpersonal skills and knowledge, indicating that students possessing strong teamwork abilities and cultural adaptability exhibit greater engagement in professional environments. This conclusion is similar to what you found when you looked at how willing respondents were to learn from team members from different cultures as a useful but still developing skill (28).

In terms of the Ethical Foundation

The data on the level of work readiness of the respondents in terms of ethical foundation were computed using weighted mean (WM) and standard deviation (SD).

Table 8 shows how ready the respondents are for work based on their ethical foundation. The weighted means for all indicators were between 2.67 and 2.97, which is in the Moderately Competent range. The highest score (WM = 2.97) was for showing honesty and integrity, while the lowest score (WM = 2.67) was for facing moral dilemmas. The overall weighted mean of 2.80 (SD = 0.71) shows that the people who answered the survey are generally moderately competent in their ethical duties, such as social responsibility, following professional standards, making ethical decisions, and thinking about the welfare of stakeholders.

Table 7: Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents in Terms of Interpersonal Foundation

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	I am able to manage my responsibilities and time effectively when working independently in a multi-disciplinary team.	2.93	0.73	Moderately Competent
2	I enjoy contributing ideas and expertise in multi-disciplinary teams during discussions.	2.85	0.80	Moderately Competent
3	I like hearing about the unique contributions that individuals share to the group.	3.10	0.77	Moderately Competent
4	I am able to create different perspectives and knowledge from various disciplines to achieve team goals.	2.84	0.78	Moderately Competent
5	I am confident in my ability to resolve conflicts in a team setting.	2.87	0.76	Moderately Competent
6	I am flexible and adaptable to different roles and responsibilities in varied tasks.	2.92	0.76	Moderately Competent
7	I am able to adjust my communication style to accommodate the different cultural backgrounds of my colleagues.	2.94	0.75	Moderately Competent
8	I like to take initiatives to lead and participate in different teams to tackle complex problems.	2.73	0.79	Moderately Competent
9	I am open to learning from team members with different cultural viewpoints and working methods.	3.12	0.78	Moderately Competent
10	I collaborate with team members who have expertise in areas different from my own.	3.06	0.74	Moderately Competent
Aggregate Weighted Mean		2.94		Moderately Competent
Aggregate Standard Deviation			0.77	

Table 8: Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents in Terms of Ethical Foundation

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	I can show an adequate understanding of the link between professional achievement and social responsibility.	2.77	0.75	Moderately Competent
2	I can take the initiative to confront moral dilemmas that occur in my fields of specialization.	2.67	0.70	Moderately Competent
3	I can regularly display an understanding of professional, social, and ethical obligations.	2.83	0.73	Moderately Competent
4	I can incorporate ethical issues into my decision-making processes successfully.	2.76	0.70	Moderately Competent
5	I can demonstrate social responsibility on a continual basis by actively participating in community involvement programs.	2.75	0.71	Moderately Competent
6	I can demonstrate a strong commitment to upholding professional standards in my conduct.	2.75	0.71	Moderately Competent
7	I can demonstrate a high level of integrity and honesty in my professional and social activities.	2.97	0.70	Moderately Competent
8	I can assess the possible societal influence of my decisions and behaviors on a regular basis.	2.85	0.72	Moderately Competent
9	I can participate in ethical problem-solving while considering the welfare of every stakeholder.	2.82	0.71	Moderately Competent
10	I can actively explore ways to constructively contribute to my professional and social settings.	2.84	0.70	Moderately Competent
Aggregate Weighted Mean	2.80		Moderately Competent	
Aggregate Standard Deviation		0.71		

Table 9: Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents in Terms of Socio-Cultural Foundation

S/N	Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
1	I display an eagerness to learn and share knowledge about historical events.	2.95	0.78	Moderately Competent
2	I can recognize cultural heritages.	2.76	0.73	Moderately Competent
3	I can always demonstrate and identify cultural values and practices.	2.76	0.68	Moderately Competent
4	I can promote awareness about the cultural heritage	2.88	0.74	Moderately Competent
5	I can consistently engage in celebrating traditional and custom activities	2.82	0.73	Moderately Competent
6	I can pass down to younger generations the knowledge about a certain culture.	2.93	0.78	Moderately Competent
7	I can articulate clearly the significance of historical landmarks.	2.73	0.76	Moderately Competent
8	I can participate in the preservation of cultural artifacts.	2.87	0.79	Moderately Competent
9	I am adept at explaining how historical occurrences have affected modern-day Filipino culture	2.77	0.76	Moderately Competent
10	I can incorporate cultural elements into personal and professional endeavors.	2.71	0.74	Moderately Competent
Aggregate Weighted Mean	2.82		Moderately Competent	
Aggregate Standard Deviation	0.75			

Table 9 summarizes the respondents' level of work readiness in terms of socio-cultural foundation. Weighted means range from 2.71 to 2.95, all falling within the Moderately Competent category. The highest ratings were observed in eagerness to learn and share historical knowledge (WM = 2.95) and passing cultural knowledge to younger generations (WM = 2.93). The lowest mean, on the other hand, was for including cultural elements in personal and professional activities (WM = 2.71). The overall weighted mean of 2.82 (SD = 0.75) shows that most people who answered the question are moderately proficient at cultural awareness, heritage appreciation, and using socio-cultural understanding in different situations. Based on these findings, the respondents are moderately inclined toward cultural learning and sharing, but there is a need for improvement in applying cultural insights to enhance personal and professional practices. Academic institutions can address this gap by integrating culturally inclusive practices, such as promoting diverse cultural events, workshops, and interdisciplinary courses that emphasize cultural integration in a professional context. Academic institutions can foster a deeper understanding and application of socio-cultural dynamics by providing opportunities to participate in community extension programs and other community exposure. Through this foundation, students can navigate and thrive in increasingly globalized and multicultural work environments. This study provides insights into how socio-cultural competence can be effectively developed within educational settings. This research fosters cultural awareness, adaptability, and the ability to engage with diverse perspectives, which are essential components of modern education. The recommendation of this study focuses on embedding the students in real-world sociocultural practices, such as charitable projects and cultural immersion activities, significantly enhancing their readiness to function in varied professional environments (30).

Summary of the Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents

This portion presented the summary of the level of work readiness of the respondents.

Table 10 shows a summary of how ready each respondent is to work in each of the five competency areas. The professional (WM = 2.82), communication (WM = 2.64), interpersonal (WM = 2.94), ethical (WM = 2.80), and socio-cultural (WM = 2.82) components all fall into the Moderately Competent category. Interpersonal foundation received the highest score (WM = 2.94), which means that people thought they were better at working together and building relationships. The communication foundation had the lowest mean (WM = 2.64), which means that it is an area that needs more development. The grand mean of 2.80 shows that, in general, the people who answered show a moderate level of work readiness in all of the areas.

Students are more ready for work when they can communicate eloquently, work well with others, and show empathy. These skills help people move into professional roles more easily by making them more flexible and better at solving problems in groups. These results indicate that enhancing interpersonal skills in college can improve students' readiness for dynamic work settings, equipping them to thrive in collaborative and customer-oriented positions (31).

Table 10: Summary of the Level of Work Readiness of the Respondents

Components	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Professional Foundation	2.82	0.69	Moderately Competent
Communication Foundation	2.64	0.73	Moderately Competent
Interpersonal Foundation	2.94	0.77	Moderately Competent
Ethical Foundation	2.80	0.71	Moderately Competent
Socio-cultural Foundation	2.82	0.75	Moderately Competent
Grand Mean	2.80		Moderately Competent
Grand Standard Deviation		0.73	

Table 11: Quality of Mindset of the Respondents in Terms of Fixed Mindset

Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Item 1	2.60	0.75	Good
Item 2	2.61	0.79	Good
Item 3	2.67	0.82	Good
Item 4	2.91	0.76	Good
Aggregate Weighted Mean	2.70		Good
Aggregate Standard Deviation		0.78	

Legend: 3.25-4.00-Excellent; 2.50-3.24-Good; 1.75-2.49-Poor; 1.00-1.74-Very Poor

Summary Quality of Mindset of the respondents in terms of Fixed Mindset

This part summarized the quality of mindset in terms of a fixed mindset. Table 11 shows how the respondents' fixed mindset affects their quality of mindset. The weighted means for all the indicators were between 2.60 and 2.91, which is in the good range. The highest score (WM = 2.91) suggests that people are more likely to agree with statements that reflect fixed beliefs. The other items also show that people tend to stick to fixed-mindset traits. The overall weighted mean of 2.70 (SD = 0.78) shows that most respondents have a good level of fixed mindset. This means that even though they don't strongly believe in rigid beliefs about their abilities, some fixed thinking is still there and could affect their motivation, persistence, and how they confront challenges. These results indicate that the respondents must confront their fixed mindset tendencies, as this mindset may hinder their adaptability, receptiveness to feedback, and resilience when confronted with challenges. It is important to help the respondents change their mindset to one of growth so that they can embrace lifelong learning, overcome challenges, and be more ready for work in a fast-paced and competitive work environment. Recent research suggests that rather than directly improving performance, growth-mindset therapies largely boost self-belief and effort management, which leads to academic benefits. In order for mindset changes to result in increased perseverance and workplace adaptability, interventions meant to improve work readiness should combine growth-mindset messaging with practical techniques to boost students' self-efficacy and effort-regulation (32).

Summary Quality of Mindset of the Respondents in terms of Growth Mindset

This portion presented the summary of the quality of mindset in terms of fixed mindset. Table 12 shows how the people who answered the survey thought about having a growth mindset. All indicators had weighted means between 2.95 and 3.17, which means they were always in the "Good" range. The highest score (WM = 3.17) means that most people agree that effort and learning can help people strengthen their skills. The overall weighted mean of 3.10 shows that most people have a positive attitude toward growth, which means they are open to improvement, persistence, and learning new skills. The results indicate that the respondents exhibit a favorable disposition towards a growth mindset, signifying a belief in the malleability of intelligence and personality traits. This way of thinking could make them more open to learning, better at dealing with problems, and more willing to take advantage of chances to grow personally and professionally. This kind of thinking is important for adjusting to the needs of work environments that are constantly changing and growing.

Table 12: Quality of Mindset of the Respondents in Terms of Growth Mindset

Indicators	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Item 1	3.14	0.61	Good
Item 2	2.95	0.63	Good
Item 3	3.13	0.63	Good
Item 4	3.17	0.65	Good
Aggregate Weighted Mean	3.10		Good

This study underscores the growth mindset, illustrating that students with growth-oriented beliefs are more likely to view their intelligence and skills as capable of improvement, thus promoting perseverance. These students are also more likely to do things that help them in school, showing that they can adapt and bounce back (33).

Summary of the Quality of Mindset of the Respondents

This portion presented the summary of the quality of mindset of the Respondents Table 13 shows how the people who answered the questions rated their quality of mindset in both fixed and growth areas. Both parts are in the good range, but the growth mindset (WM = 3.10, SD = 0.63) was rated higher than the fixed mindset (WM = 2.70, SD = 0.78). This indicates that although respondents maintain certain fixed beliefs regarding personal traits and abilities, they exhibit a greater propensity for growth-oriented thinking. The grand mean of 2.90 also shows that the overall quality of mindset is favorable, which means that people generally have a positive attitude toward learning, getting better, and the idea that skills can improve over time. The results show that the respondents' mindset of wanting to grow slightly is a positive sign that they are ready to work. This growth mindset will help the people flexible, strong, and willing to learn.

Table 13: Summary of the Quality of Mindset of the Respondents

Components	WM	SD	Verbal Description
Fixed Mindset	2.70	0.78	Good
Growth Mindset	3.10	0.63	Good
Grand Mean	2.90		Good
Grand Standard Deviation		0.71	

Furthermore, we need more educational strategies and programs to help people develop their growth mindset beliefs. Respondents could learn how to let go of their fixed mindset and fully embrace growth-oriented perspectives by going to workshops on resilience, problem-solving, and reflective practices. These types of support would better prepare individuals for continuous learning and advancement in their careers. This article discusses the connection between a growth mindset and improved academic performance, as well as various self-regulated learning strategies (34). Another study demonstrates that directional influence, even a mild or developing growth mindset, can enhance self-regulatory behavior that fosters the adaptability and resilience stemming from growth mindset principles (35).

Relationship between the Level of Work Readiness and the Mindset of the Respondents

This portion presented the relationship between the level of work readiness and the mindset of the respondents.

Table 14 shows how the respondents' work readiness is related to their mindset. This data employs Pearson correlation analysis to investigate the association between work readiness and mindset among the respondents. The analysis shows an r-value of 0.094, which means that there is a tiny positive relationship between the two variables. This means that readiness to work and having the right mindset are almost unconnected. The p-value is 0.092, which is higher than the level of significance (0.05) that was set for a two-tailed test. Consequently, the decision is to retain the null hypothesis (Ho), signifying no statistically significant correlation between work readiness and mindset among the respondents. Based on these results, there is no significant link between the respondents' levels of work readiness and their mindsets. This indicates that the observed minimal positive correlation is probably attributable to chance and does not substantiate a significant relationship between the two variables. Combining the mindset with other factors, such as practical experience or formal training in job-related skills, enhances its impact on career development. This finding indicates that mindset alone may not serve as a reliable predictor of work readiness; rather, it interacts with practical skill development to influence work readiness outcomes. These findings indicate that while mindset development is advantageous, enhancing work readiness may require direct experience and specialized training beyond mere shifts in mindset, supporting the conclusion that mindset does not significantly affect work readiness in this context. This research offers a more refined viewpoint by emphasizing the interactive influences of mindset and experiential learning. This difference brings attention to the value of context and the interaction of various factors in determining work readiness.

Table 14: Test of the Relationship between the Level of Work Readiness and the Mindset of the Respondents

Variables	r-value	Strength of Correlation	p-value	Decision	Remarks
Work Readiness and Mindset	0.094	Negligible Positive	0.092	Do not reject	
Ho	Not Significant				

*significant at p<0.05 (two-tailed)

Resilience mediates the influence of growth mindset and emotional intelligence on the capacity to manage daily challenges; additionally, mindset contributes to favorable psychological outcomes, such as resilience and buoyancy, but does not independently serve as a strong predictor of applied or behavioral readiness outcomes (36, 37).

Conclusion

The study's results indicate that the respondents exhibited a more robust foundation in interpersonal skills, while their communication abilities necessitate further enhancement to improve their overall preparedness. In other areas, such as professional, ethical, and socio-cultural foundations, the people who answered showed a moderate level of work readiness. These findings indicate that respondents' preparedness for employment may be more significantly affected by external factors, including practical experiences, institutional support, familial background, and socio-economic conditions, rather than solely by intrinsic attributes such as mindset.

Moreover, the respondents demonstrated a balanced, albeit slightly growth-oriented, mindset, indicating a belief in their capacity for improvement and adaptability, although some exhibited fixed mindset tendencies. The data indicated that the respondents exhibited a moderately positive disposition towards a growth mindset; however, this did not significantly influence their preparedness for employment. A growth mindset is still an important part of personal growth, but it needs to be paired with structured skill development to help students grow in all areas. The analysis, however, found no statistically significant link between how ready the respondents were to work and how favorable their mindset. This underscores the necessity to investigate additional factors that may more

effectively elucidate disparities in student work readiness. This research elucidates the concept of work readiness by examining the impact of mindset quality on preparedness in underrepresented fourth-year university students, utilizing a validated self-report instrument to evaluate multidimensional competencies.

Lastly, schools should do more than just encourage a growth mindset. Students need programs that combine hands-on learning, mentorship, and skills-based training to provide them the skills and experiences they need to succeed in their chosen fields. These interventions can help fill in the gaps in readiness and get students ready for success in their future jobs.

Subsequent research ought to employ longitudinal methodologies and incorporate supplementary variables, including career aspirations, part-time employment experience, and internship involvement, to augment the understanding of factors influencing work readiness and mindset.

Limitations

This study concentrated on evaluating the work readiness and quality mindset of fourth-year students enrolled in diverse programs at a state university in Bohol, Philippines. The study was limited to these particular variables; therefore, the results should not be extrapolated to individual students or the entire university student body.

The study acknowledges the inherent limitations of its cross-sectional and self-report methodology. Because the analyses are correlational, the results can't show how the variables are related to each other. Moreover, common-method variance may have affected the observed associations. When looking at the results, you should keep these limits in mind.

Abbreviations

None.

Acknowledgement

The authors extend their sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their valuable contributions in enhancing the quality of this study. We also extend our appreciation to the university administration and the respondents for their unwavering support and cooperation throughout the research process.

Author Contributions

Maria Jennifer G Cubillo: conceptualization, data gathering, primary writing of the manuscript, Melona C Deguma: supervised the interpretation of salient findings, guided the alignment of the study's implications, Vicente J Igot: assisted in data collection, validation of findings, contributed critical revisions to strengthen the paper.

Conflict of Interest

The researchers disclose and confirm that there is no occurrence of conflict of interest.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Assistance

The author declares that generative AI and AI-assisted technologies were used only to support the writing process by improving grammar, organizing ideas, and enhancing clarity. The content, analysis, and conclusions presented in this paper are the author's original work, and the author takes full responsibility for them.

Ethics Approval

The study was conducted in accordance with the Self-Declaration. The study was approved by the head of the university before it was conducted. All the respondents were given informed consent. Gathered data is handled with utmost confidentiality.

Funding

The study received no funding from any agency or research institution.

References

1. Magfiroh F, Jaro'ah S. Gen Z and the world of work: a study literature of new graduates' challenges in building job readiness. In: International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2023 (IJCAH 2023); 2023 Dec 19. p. 1194–1205. Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-152-4_122
2. Jiang Y, Liu H, Yao Y, Li Q, Li Y. The positive effects of growth mindset on students intention toward self-regulated learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: a PLS-SEM approach. Sustainability. 2023;15(3):2180.
3. Pham LTT. Work readiness of graduates in the digital age: A literature review. Ho Chi Minh City Open University Journal of Science-Social Sciences. 2024;14(2):120–128. https://doi.org/10.46223/HCMCOUJS.soci.en.14.2.2820.2024
4. World Economic Forum. The Future of Jobs Report 2023. Geneva: World Economic Forum; 2023. https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2023/

5. Giray CGB, Quianzon FSM. Interest, self-efficacy and environmental influences on the career decision-making of adolescents. J Community Dev Res Hum Soc Sci. 2023;16(4):33–44.
6. Magallanes CI. Engagement and work readiness of college students. Technium Soc Sci J. 2022;35:111.
7. Pabilando RS, Sabonsolin RT. Employability skills and self-efficacy among students at Biliran Province State University. Interdiscip Soc Stud. 2023;2(7):2106–17.
8. Ali AA. The predictive relationship of academic life satisfaction and work readiness among fresh graduates: a basis for formulating a work readiness program. Soc Sci Lens World J Hum Dyn Soc Relat. 2024;2(1):10–20.
9. Winda RG, Lukito H. The readiness of Indonesian workers in facing the future world of work. Enrichment J Manag. 2022;12(2):2004–11.
10. Pangilinan FN, Generalao L. Bridging the gap: work readiness of state university graduates in the Philippines. J Educ Manag Dev Stud. 2022;2(1):45–62.
11. Bain A, Jacobs N. The impact of a resilience-building program on the academic performance and mindset of final-year university students. J Appl Res High Educ. 2020;12(3):482–98.
12. Limeri LB, Carter NT, Choe J, Harper HG, Martin HR, Benton A, Dolan EL. Growing a growth mindset: characterizing how and why undergraduate students' mindsets change. Int J STEM Educ. 2020;7(1):35.
13. Bernecker K, Job V. Mindset theory. In: Mavor KI, Platow MJ, Bizumic B, editors. Social Psychology in Action: Evidence-based Interventions from Theory to Practice. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2019. p. 179–91. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-13788-5_12
14. Murphy MC, Reeves SL. Personal and organizational mindset at work. Res Organ Behav. 2019;39:100121.
15. Nauta MM. The development, evolution, and status of Holland's theory of vocational personalities: reflections and future directions for counseling psychology. J Couns Psychol. 2010;57(1):11.
16. Tiro Y, Afdal A, Yusuf AM. Understanding career choice based on INER family parenting: Roe personality theory. Widyagogik J Pendidik Pembelajaran Sekolah Dasar. 2021;9(1):1–13.
17. Super D. Developmental self-concept. J Manajemen. 2012;20(2):245–6. https://edcp-educ.sites.olt.ubc.ca/files/2019/01/Supplemental-Materials.pdf
18. Taguchi N. Description and explanation of pragmatic development: quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods research. System. 2018;75:23–32. doi:10.1016/j.system.2018.03.010
19. Bloomfield J, Fisher MJ. Quantitative research design. J Australas Rehabil Nurses Assoc. 2019;22(2):27–30.
20. Remler DK, Van Ryzin GG. Research Methods in Practice: Strategies for Description and Causation. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 2021. https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=IM8fEAAAQBAJ
21. Dweck CS. Mindset: The New Psychology of Success. New York: Random House; 2006. https://books.google.com.ph/books?id=fdjqz0TPL2wC
22. Dweck CS. The journey to children's mindsets—and beyond. Child Dev Perspect. 2017;11(2):139–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12225
23. Smith TE, Sheridan SM, Kim EM, Park S, Beretvas SN. The effects of family-school partnership interventions on academic and social-emotional functioning: a meta-analysis exploring what works for whom. Educ Psychol Rev. 2020;32:511–44.
24. Giray CGB, Deguma JJ. Emotional state and psychological fortitude of teacher education students from disrupted family background in a state university. Int Res J Multidiscip Scope. 2025;6(3):240–57.
25. Black SE, Devereux PJ, Salvanes KG. Older and wiser? Birth order and IQ of young men. CESifo Econ Stud. 2011;57(1):103–20.
26. Bhandari RB, Timsina TP. Examining the impact of parents' education on students' academic achievements. Shanlax Int J Arts Sci Humanit. 2024;11(4):102–10.
27. Fedesco HN, Cavin D, Henares R. Field-based learning in higher education: exploring the benefits and possibilities. J Scholarsh Teach Learn. 2020;20(1):65–84. https://scholarworks.iu.edu/journals/index.php/josotl/article/view/24877
28. Ahmed STS. From communicative competence to communication proficiency: A theoretical study. Acuity J Engl Lang Pedagog Lit Cult. 2023;8(1):13–22.
29. Indrawati CDS, Subarno A, Winarno W, Permansah S, Wirawan AW, Rusmana D. Influence of work motivation, interpersonal skills, and knowledge construction on the work readiness of vocational students. Educ Res Int. 2023;2023(1):4956337.
30. Tractenberg R. 10 simple rules for integrating ethics training into any quantitative course. CHANCE. 2023;36(1):35–9.
31. Anatolievna MO, Nikolaevna SG, Gennadievna YT. Socio-cultural competence of students and the results of general education. Eur Proc Soc Behav Sci. 2021;56:34–45.
32. Ba Y, Ming W, Zhang H. Unlocking academic success: how growth mindset interventions enhance student performance through self-belief and effort regulation. Acta Psychol. 2025;256:104977.
33. Tapia Castillo CV. Developing growth language learning mindsets to facilitate motivation and academic achievement among Chilean learners of English [dissertation]. Colchester (UK): University of Essex; 2023. http://repository.essex.ac.uk/id/eprint/35839
34. Correa-Rojas J, Grimaldo M, Marcelo-Torres E, Manzanares-Medina E, Ravelo-Contreras EL. Growth mindset, grit, and academic self-efficacy as determinants of academic performance in Peruvian university students. Int J Educ Psychol. 2024;13(2):124–42.
35. Xu KM, Leferink J, Wijnia L. A review of the relationship between student growth mindset and self-regulated learning. Front Educ. 2025;10: 1539639.
36. Yuan RM, Peng WY, Jiang J. Relationship between growth mindset and self-control among Chinese

primary school students: a longitudinal study. Psychol Res Behav Manag. 2024;17:3101–9.
37. Liu R. Psychological resources for academic buoyancy: the roles of growth mindset and emotional intelligence in Chinese university students. Front Psychol. 2025;16:1580929.

How to Cite: Cubillo MJG, Deguma MC, Igot VJ, Capuno RG. Work Readiness and the Quality of Mindset of the Fourth Year Students in a State University. Int Res J Multidiscip Scope. 2026; 7(1): 769-784.
DOI: 10.47857/irjms.2026.v07i01.07689