

Crisis Management Strategies and Their Impact on School Disaster Preparedness

Melbert P. Pacampara¹, Renno Jose B. Gabuya²

¹Teacher III, Hagbay ES, San Jose de Buan District

²EdD, SB Secretary, LGU Motiong, Samar

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600670>

Received: 11 June 2026; Accepted: 16 June 2026; Published: 01 July 2026

ABSTRACT

This study employed a descriptive-correlational and comparative research design to evaluate crisis management strategies and their impact on school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar, for School Year 2025–2026. Findings revealed significant differences between school administrators and teachers in their assessments of crisis management implementation and disaster preparedness across all dimensions, indicating variations in perceptions based on roles and experiences. Results also showed that only administrators' attitude toward crisis management was significantly related to both implementation and preparedness, while a strong positive relationship was found between crisis management implementation and disaster preparedness, highlighting their interdependence. Moreover, administrators reported that crisis management implementation and disaster preparedness were highly evident, although they consistently encountered challenges such as limited funding and insufficient emergency supplies. Overall, the study emphasizes the importance of enhancing collaboration, strengthening resources, and improving attitudes and capacities to ensure effective crisis management and improved school disaster preparedness.

Keywords: Crisis Management Strategies, School Disaster Preparedness, Comparative Research, School Administrators and Teachers, Descriptive-Correlational Study

INTRODUCTION

The increasing frequency and intensity of disasters have made crisis management and disaster preparedness essential components of school leadership. From the researcher's perspective, schools are no longer merely institutions for learning but are also frontline environments that must ensure the safety and survival of learners and personnel during emergencies. Elementary schools, in particular, require strong administrative leadership because young learners are highly vulnerable and dependent during crises. Despite the existence of preparedness initiatives, many schools still struggle to translate plans into effective action. This study was therefore conceptualized to examine how crisis management strategies influence school disaster preparedness, highlighting the need to strengthen leadership practices that directly affect school safety and resilience

Globally, disaster risks have significantly affected educational systems, disrupting learning continuity and threatening the safety of school communities. Schools worldwide have been increasingly exposed to hazards such as earthquakes, floods, pandemics, and fires, which necessitate comprehensive preparedness measures. Effective crisis management has been recognized as a critical factor in minimizing damage and ensuring rapid recovery in educational settings. However, global reports indicate that while many schools have disaster plans, gaps remain in implementation, coordination, and stakeholder involvement. This underscores the importance of examining how leadership strategies translate into actual preparedness outcomes in schools (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, 2021).

At the national level, the Philippines is considered one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world, making school preparedness a critical concern. The government has established legal frameworks to institutionalize

disaster risk reduction in schools. The Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010 (Republic Act No. 10121) mandates all institutions, including schools, to adopt proactive measures in disaster preparedness, mitigation, and response. This law emphasizes the role of local institutions in building resilient communities and ensuring safety during disasters. It highlights the responsibility of school leaders to implement structured crisis management strategies aligned with national policies (Republic Act No. 10121, 2010).

Complementing this, the Department of Education institutionalized disaster preparedness in schools through the DepEd Comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) in Basic Education Framework (DepEd Order No. 37, s. 2015). This policy requires schools to establish DRRM committees, conduct hazard assessments, and implement preparedness and response mechanisms. It also emphasizes capacity building, coordination, and continuous monitoring of safety practices within schools. Despite these mandates, the effectiveness of implementation largely depends on how school administrators translate these policies into actionable strategies. This reinforces the importance of examining leadership-driven crisis management practices in relation to preparedness outcomes (Department of Education, 2015).

In the regional and divisional context, disaster preparedness remains a priority, yet challenges persist in ensuring consistent and effective implementation across schools. Reports from educational divisions indicate that while schools comply with required drills and planning activities, variations exist in the quality of execution, resource allocation, and stakeholder participation. These inconsistencies suggest that compliance alone does not guarantee preparedness, and that leadership strategies play a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of disaster management efforts. This highlights the need to investigate how administrative practices influence preparedness at the school level (Department of Education, 2023).

At the local level, data from the District of San Jose de Buan revealed varying levels of participation in disaster preparedness trainings among school administrators and teachers over the past three School Years. In School Year 2022–2023, forty-two percent of school administrators and fifty-eight percent of teachers participated in disaster preparedness trainings, primarily focusing on earthquake and fire drills. In School Year 2023–2024, participation increased to fifty-five percent of administrators and sixty-three percent of teachers, with training topics expanding to include typhoon and flood response. By School Year 2025–2026, participation further increased to sixty-eight percent for administrators and seventy-one percent for teachers, covering earthquake, fire, typhoon, and first-aid response. While these data indicated progress in capacity building, they also revealed that not all personnel consistently engaged in preparedness activities, suggesting gaps in the implementation of crisis management strategies at the school level.

Meanwhile, the assessment of Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) using the DRRM checklist across the 15 schools in the District of San Jose de Buan revealed varying levels of preparedness in terms of Safe Learning Facilities (Pillar 1), School Disaster Management (Pillar 2), and Disaster Risk Reduction in Education (Pillar 3). Using a percentage-based scoring system, the results highlight the structural, organizational, and instructional aspects of school preparedness. For Pillar 1, schools are prepared (75.33%), indicating that basic safety measures such as evacuation routes, signage, and structural safety are generally in place, though some gaps remain in assessments and equipment. In Pillar 2, schools are moderately prepared (68.00%), suggesting that while DRRM structures and plans exist, their implementation, coordination, and documentation are not consistently practiced. Similarly, Pillar 3 shows a moderately prepared level (60.67%), indicating that DRRM is integrated into teaching and learning but not yet systematically or consistently implemented across schools (District DRRM Report, 2024).

Despite existing policies and increasing participation in training programs, there remains a significant gap in understanding how crisis management strategies of school administrators influence the overall disaster preparedness of schools. Previous studies have focused primarily on compliance with DRRM policies and participation in activities, but limited attention has been given to how leadership decisions, strategic planning, and coordination practices affect preparedness outcomes. This study addressed this gap by examining the relationship between crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan. Its uniqueness lies in its focus on administrative strategies as key determinants of preparedness,

providing practical insights for improving leadership practices, strengthening policy implementation, and enhancing the safety and resilience of school communities

LITERATURE REVIEW

Crisis management and school disaster preparedness have become increasingly important components of educational leadership and school governance due to the growing frequency and complexity of natural disasters, health emergencies, security threats, and other crisis situations affecting educational institutions worldwide. Schools are expected not only to provide quality education but also to ensure the safety, security, and well-being of learners, teachers, and other stakeholders. Crisis management refers to the systematic process of planning, organizing, coordinating, and implementing actions before, during, and after emergencies to minimize risks, reduce vulnerabilities, and ensure continuity of operations (Coombs, 2021). Effective crisis management enables schools to respond appropriately to emergencies while minimizing disruptions to teaching and learning processes. This perspective aligns with the principles of the Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Framework, which emphasizes preparedness, prevention, mitigation, response, and recovery as essential components of organizational resilience. According to the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR, 2023), educational institutions that adopt proactive crisis management practices are better positioned to protect lives, reduce damages, and maintain educational continuity during and after disaster events.

Within this context, leadership has emerged as one of the most significant determinants of organizational preparedness and resilience. School administrators serve as key decision-makers responsible for planning, coordinating, and directing emergency response activities. Effective leaders demonstrate the ability to make timely decisions, communicate clearly, mobilize resources, and provide guidance during crisis situations. Harris, Jones, and Hashim (2021) emphasized that educational leadership plays a crucial role in strengthening organizational preparedness through collaboration, accountability, and stakeholder engagement. Similarly, McLeod and Dulskey (2021) found that schools led by adaptive and proactive leaders demonstrated greater resilience and were better able to sustain educational operations during periods of uncertainty and disruption. These findings suggest that leadership effectiveness contributes significantly to a school's ability to anticipate, respond to, and recover from emergencies. However, leadership alone may not fully explain variations in preparedness outcomes. While some scholars emphasize leadership as the primary driver of preparedness, others argue that preparedness is strengthened when leadership practices are complemented by effective communication systems, stakeholder participation, and organizational learning processes. Consequently, preparedness should be viewed as a multidimensional phenomenon influenced by the interaction of leadership, communication, organizational culture, and stakeholder engagement.

Furthermore, communication management is widely recognized as a vital component of effective crisis management. During emergencies, the timely and accurate dissemination of information helps reduce uncertainty, prevent misinformation, and facilitate coordinated responses among stakeholders. Coombs (2021) argued that effective crisis communication enables organizations to maintain trust, promote transparency, and support informed decision-making during emergencies. In educational settings, communication systems must ensure that administrators, teachers, learners, parents, and community partners receive accurate and timely information before, during, and after crisis events. The effectiveness of communication protocols directly influences the efficiency of emergency response and recovery efforts. Supporting this argument, recent studies have emphasized that schools with well-established communication mechanisms exhibit higher levels of preparedness because stakeholders possess a clearer understanding of emergency procedures, roles, and responsibilities.

In addition to leadership and communication, training and capacity building have consistently been identified as essential elements of preparedness and resilience. Schools that regularly conduct emergency drills, simulations, and disaster preparedness training activities help develop the competencies necessary for effective crisis response. Mutch (2020) observed that continuous professional development enhances the confidence, knowledge, and skills of school personnel in handling emergency situations. Likewise, preparedness activities encourage stakeholders to become active participants in disaster risk reduction initiatives, thereby fostering a

culture of safety and readiness within the school environment. From an organizational resilience perspective, capacity building should not be viewed as a one-time intervention but rather as a continuous process of learning, adaptation, and improvement that enables schools to respond effectively to emerging risks and changing conditions.

More recently, international scholarship has increasingly emphasized the concept of school resilience as a critical dimension of disaster preparedness. School resilience refers to the capacity of educational institutions to anticipate, withstand, adapt to, and recover from disruptions while maintaining learning continuity and organizational effectiveness. Kaim, Siman-Tov, Adini, and Lev-Ari (2023) emphasized that resilient schools are characterized by adaptive leadership, collaborative decision-making, stakeholder engagement, and flexible organizational systems that enable them to sustain educational services during crises. Similarly, Tafti et al. (2020) highlighted that resilience encompasses not only physical safety and infrastructure but also social relationships, institutional learning, and organizational adaptability. These perspectives broaden the traditional understanding of preparedness by suggesting that schools must not only respond effectively to emergencies but also develop the capacity to recover quickly and continue fulfilling their educational mission under adverse circumstances.

The significance of school resilience became particularly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, which disrupted educational systems worldwide and exposed weaknesses in existing preparedness mechanisms. The pandemic demonstrated that disaster preparedness extends beyond traditional emergency response and includes the ability to sustain teaching, learning, and support services under prolonged crisis conditions. Studies conducted following the pandemic revealed that schools with established crisis management systems, stakeholder engagement mechanisms, and flexible leadership structures were more successful in maintaining educational continuity and minimizing learning disruptions (McLeod & Dulsky, 2021; Kaim et al., 2023). Consequently, contemporary preparedness frameworks increasingly emphasize resilience-based educational management, which integrates emergency preparedness with long-term organizational adaptability, continuity planning, and recovery strategies.

Similarly, the growing body of research on crisis leadership further underscores the importance of leadership quality in determining preparedness outcomes. Reyes-Guerra, Maslin-Ostrowski, Barakat, and Stefanovic (2021) found that school leaders who foster trust, collaboration, and stakeholder engagement are more effective in navigating complex crisis situations. Likewise, Qian and Walker (2022) emphasized that crisis leadership extends beyond decision-making and includes the capacity to facilitate organizational learning, encourage collaboration, and support adaptation during periods of uncertainty. While McLeod and Dulsky (2021) highlighted adaptive leadership and organizational flexibility as essential for educational continuity, Reyes-Guerra et al. (2021) stressed the importance of social capital and relationship-building in strengthening preparedness and resilience. These differing perspectives suggest that preparedness cannot be attributed solely to leadership authority but rather emerges from the interaction between leadership practices, communication systems, organizational culture, and stakeholder participation.

Nevertheless, despite the recognized importance of crisis management and disaster preparedness, schools continue to encounter numerous implementation challenges. Research consistently identifies inadequate funding, insufficient emergency supplies, infrastructure limitations, and logistical constraints as major barriers to preparedness efforts. Horton, Spigelmyer, Zoucha, and Rebmann (2023) reported that many schools struggle to translate preparedness policies into practice because of resource-related challenges. Such limitations may affect the acquisition of emergency equipment, conduct of preparedness activities, and maintenance of safety infrastructure necessary for effective disaster management. These findings suggest that preparedness is influenced not only by leadership and planning but also by the availability of financial, material, and institutional resources needed to support implementation.

Another important consideration in the literature involves the role of attitudes and perceptions in influencing preparedness-related behaviors. According to Protection Motivation Theory, individuals who perceive threats as serious and believe that preparedness actions are effective are more likely to engage in behaviors that enhance

safety and resilience. Paton (2020) argued that positive attitudes toward preparedness are associated with stronger commitment to disaster risk reduction activities, greater support for safety initiatives, and increased participation in preparedness programs. Within educational settings, school administrators' attitudes may significantly influence the prioritization and implementation of crisis management strategies, thereby affecting overall preparedness outcomes.

Collectively, the literature indicates that school disaster preparedness is a multidimensional construct shaped by leadership effectiveness, communication management, training and capacity building, stakeholder participation, organizational culture, resource availability, and institutional resilience. Although scholars differ regarding the relative importance of these factors, there is broad consensus that effective crisis management contributes significantly to preparedness outcomes and organizational resilience. However, much of the existing research has focused on national-level programs, specific disaster events, or urban educational settings. Comparatively fewer studies have examined the relationship between crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness within local public-school contexts, particularly from the perspectives of both school administrators and teachers. Moreover, limited attention has been given to the role of administrators' attitudes toward crisis management as a factor influencing preparedness outcomes. This gap in the literature underscores the need for the present study, which seeks to examine the crisis management strategies implemented by school administrators and determine their impact on school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar. The findings are expected to contribute to the growing body of knowledge on organizational resilience, crisis leadership, and school disaster preparedness while providing evidence that may guide policy development, capacity-building initiatives, and school safety interventions.

Research Questions

This study determined the crisis management strategies and its impact on school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar during School Year 2025-2026.

Specifically, the study sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the school administrator-respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 age and sex;
 - 1.2 civil status;
 - 1.3 highest educational attainment;
 - 1.4 . number of years as school administrator;
 - 1.5 position/ designation;
 - 1.6 relevant in-service trainings;
 - 1.7 performance rating based on the latest OPCRf; and
 - 1.8 attitude toward crisis management?
2. What is the level of implementation of crisis management strategies of school administrators as assessed by teacher respondents and themselves in terms of the following:
 - 2.2 preparedness and planning;
 - 2.3 . leadership and decision-making;
 - 2.4 communication management;

-
- 2.5 training and capability building; and,
 - 2.6 safety and recovery management?
 3. What is the level of school disaster preparedness as perceived by school administrator-respondents and teacher-respondents in terms of the following:
 - 3.1 disaster preparedness planning;
 - 3.2 organizational structure and roles;
 - 3.3 capacity building and training;
 - 3.4 early warning and communication systems; and
 - 3.5 safety measure and resources?
 4. Is there a significant difference on the level of assessment of school administrator-and teacher-respondents with regard to the following:
 - 4.1 assessed level of implementation of crisis management strategies; and
 - 4.2 assessed level of implementation of school disaster preparedness?
 5. Is there a significant relationship between the school administrator-respondents' profile and the following:
 - 5.1 assessed level of implementation of crisis management strategies; and
 - 5.2 assessed level of school disaster preparedness?
 6. Is there a significant relationship between the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness?
 7. What are the challenges encountered by the school administrator-respondents in the implementation of crisis management strategies?

Scope And Limitation

This research determined the crisis management strategies and its impact on school disaster preparedness among elementary school administrators in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar.

It appraised the school administrator-respondents profile in terms of their age and sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as school administrator, position/ designation, relevant in-service trainings, performance rating based on the latest OPCRF, and attitude toward crisis management.

The study also aimed to provide a comprehensive assessment on the level of implementation of crisis management strategies of school administrators as assessed by teacher respondents and themselves in terms of preparedness and planning, leadership and decision-making, communication management, training and capability building, and safety and recovery management.

Moreover, it also appraised the level of school disaster preparedness as perceived by school administrator-respondents and teacher-respondents in terms of disaster preparedness planning, organizational structure and roles, capacity building and training, early warning and communication systems, and safety measure and resources.

Furthermore, the study looked into the significant difference on the level of assessment of school administrator- and teacher-respondents with regard to their assessed level of implementation of crisis management strategies and their assessed level of implementation of school disaster preparedness as well as the significant relationship between the school administrator-respondents' profile their assessed level of implementation of crisis management strategies, their assessed level of school disaster preparedness and also the significant relationship between the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness.

The challenges encountered by the challenges encountered by the school administrator-respondents in the implementation of crisis management strategies were also determined. This study was conducted during the School Year 2025-2026.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study used descriptive-correlation and comparative research design to evaluate the crisis management strategies of and their impact on school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar.

Sampling

This study employed universal sampling, also known as total enumeration, as the sampling procedure. Universal sampling is a technique wherein all members of the target population who meet the established criteria are included in the study. This approach is particularly appropriate when the population size is manageable and when the researcher intends to obtain comprehensive and accurate data from every eligible respondent.

In the context of this study, all teachers and school administrators from the public elementary and secondary schools within the San Jose de Buan District, Schools Division of Samar, were included as respondents. Rather than selecting a representative sample, the study sought to gather information from the entire population of teachers and school administrators in the district to ensure that all relevant perspectives regarding crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness were adequately represented.

Data Collection

Data were gathered through a structured survey questionnaire developed and adapted from relevant literature and previous studies on crisis management and school disaster preparedness. The instrument consisted of sections that assessed the respondents' profile, crisis management strategies employed by schools, and the level of school disaster preparedness.

Prior to data collection, the research instrument underwent content validation by experts in educational management, disaster risk reduction and management, and research methodology to ensure its relevance, clarity, and suitability for the study. Necessary revisions were incorporated based on the recommendations of the validators. Reliability testing was likewise conducted to determine the internal consistency and dependability of the instrument.

Upon securing the necessary approvals from the Schools Division Superintendent, the Public Schools District Supervisor, and the respective school heads, the questionnaires were administered to all teacher and school administrator respondents in the San Jose de Buan District, Schools Division of Samar. The respondents were informed of the objectives and significance of the study and were assured that all information provided would be treated with strict confidentiality and used solely for research purposes. Participation in the study was voluntary, and ethical standards were strictly observed throughout the data collection process.

The accomplished questionnaires were retrieved, reviewed for completeness and accuracy, coded, tabulated, and organized for statistical treatment and analysis. The collected data served as the basis for determining the crisis management strategies implemented by schools and their impact on school disaster preparedness.

Data Analysis

The data collected from the respondents were carefully checked, coded, tabulated, and subjected to appropriate statistical treatment using statistical software. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were utilized to analyze and interpret the data in accordance with the objectives of the study.

To describe the profile of the school administrator-respondents in terms of age and sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as school administrator, position/designation, relevant in-service trainings, performance rating based on the latest Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRF), and attitude toward crisis management, frequency counts, percentages, means, and standard deviations were employed as appropriate.

To determine the level of implementation of crisis management strategies of school administrators as assessed by both teacher-respondents and school administrator-respondents in terms of preparedness and planning, leadership and decision-making, communication management, training and capability building, and safety and recovery management, weighted mean and standard deviation were computed. These statistical measures were likewise used to determine the level of school disaster preparedness in terms of disaster preparedness planning, organizational structure and roles, capacity building and training, early warning and communication systems, and safety measures and resources.

To determine whether there was a significant difference between the assessments of teacher-respondents and school administrator-respondents regarding the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness, the Independent Samples t-test was utilized. This test was employed to ascertain whether the perceptions of the two groups significantly differed. In addition to significance testing, effect size measures such as Cohen's *d* and 95% confidence intervals were computed to determine the practical significance and precision of the observed differences. Cohen's *d* was used to assess the magnitude of the differences between groups, while confidence intervals provided estimates of the range within which the population parameters were likely to fall. Considering the relatively small number of school administrator respondents, the Mann-Whitney U Test was also performed as a nonparametric alternative to verify the robustness of the results.

To determine the significant relationship between the profile variables of school administrator-respondents and the assessed level of implementation of crisis management strategies as well as the level of school disaster preparedness, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson *r*) was used for continuous variables. For categorical profile variables, appropriate tests of association such as the Chi-Square Test of Independence were employed. To further validate the findings and address the small sample size of school administrator respondents, the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (Spearman's ρ) was likewise computed as a nonparametric measure of association.

To determine the significant relationship between the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness, the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (Pearson *r*) was utilized. This statistical tool measured the degree and direction of the relationship between the two variables. Corresponding effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals were reported to provide a more comprehensive interpretation of the strength and precision of the relationships. Spearman's ρ was likewise employed to confirm the consistency and robustness of the correlation results.

Finally, the challenges encountered by school administrator-respondents in the implementation of crisis management strategies were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages, and ranking to identify the most common and significant challenges experienced by the respondents.

All hypotheses were tested at the 0.05 level of significance. The results served as the basis for drawing conclusions and formulating recommendations relevant to enhancing crisis management strategies and strengthening school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 1. Profile of School Administrator Respondents (N=15)

Variable	Dominant Category/Description	f	% / Statistical Value
Age	37–41 years old	7	46.67
Sex	Female	11	73.33
Civil Status	Married	10	66.67
Highest Educational Attainment	Master's Degree Holder	8	53.33
Number of Years as School Administrator	6–10 years	7	46.67
Position/Designation	Head Teacher I	8	53.33
Relevant In-Service Trainings	School-Level Trainings	15	100.00*
Performance Rating (Latest OPCRf)	Outstanding (4.50–5.00)	15	100.00
Attitude Toward Crisis Management	Strongly Agree	—	GWM = 4.88

Table 1 presents the profile of the school administrator-respondents. The data reveal that the majority of the respondents were within the 37–41 years old age bracket, comprising 46.67% of the total population. The computed mean age of 37.53 years and median age of 37.00 years indicate that the respondents were generally in their late thirties, reflecting a relatively young yet experienced group of school leaders. In terms of sex, female administrators dominated the group, accounting for 73.33% of the respondents.

With regard to civil status, the majority of the respondents were married, representing 66.67% of the total population. In terms of educational attainment, most school administrators were Master's Degree Holders, comprising 53.33% of the respondents, indicating a strong commitment to professional growth and advanced academic preparation.

As to administrative experience, the largest proportion of respondents had served as school administrators for 6–10 years, accounting for 46.67% of the total. This suggests that most respondents possessed considerable experience in school leadership and management. Regarding position or designation, the majority were Head Teacher I, comprising 53.33% of the respondents, indicating that most school administrators occupied entry- to mid-level leadership positions within their respective schools.

In terms of participation in relevant in-service trainings, school-level trainings emerged as the most frequently attended professional development activity, obtaining the highest weighted mean of 3.93, interpreted as Always. This finding suggests that school administrators regularly engaged in capacity-building activities conducted within their schools.

With respect to performance rating, all school administrator-respondents (100.00%) obtained an Outstanding rating ranging from 4.50 to 5.00 based on the latest Office Performance Commitment and Review Form (OPCRf). This result indicates that the respondents consistently demonstrated exemplary performance in carrying out their administrative functions and responsibilities.

Finally, the respondents exhibited a highly positive attitude toward crisis management, as reflected by a grand weighted mean of 4.88, interpreted as Strongly Agree. This finding indicates that the school administrators strongly recognized the importance of effective crisis management practices and demonstrated a high level of commitment to ensuring school safety, preparedness, and resilience during emergencies and disasters.

Table 2. Summary of the Level of Implementation of Crisis Management Strategies as Assessed by School Administrators and Teachers

Dimension	School Administrators (GWM)	Interpretation	Teachers (GWM)	Interpretation
Preparedness and Planning	4.78	Strongly Agree	4.14	Agree
Leadership and Decision-Making	4.83	Strongly Agree	4.13	Agree
Communication Management	4.75	Strongly Agree	3.98	Agree
Training and Capacity Building	4.75	Strongly Agree	3.94	Agree
Safety and Recovery Management	4.73	Strongly Agree	3.98	Agree
Grand Mean	4.77	Strongly Agree	4.03	Agree

Table 2 presents the summary of the level of implementation of crisis management strategies as assessed by school administrators and teachers. The findings reveal that both groups recognized the implementation of crisis management strategies in their schools; however, school administrators consistently provided higher ratings across all dimensions than teachers. School administrators assessed the overall implementation as Strongly Agree (GWM = 4.77), while teachers assessed it as Agree (GWM = 4.03). This difference suggests that administrators, being directly involved in planning, coordinating, and monitoring crisis-related activities, may have greater awareness of the extent of implementation than teachers, whose perceptions are largely based on their direct experiences with these initiatives.

Among the dimensions, leadership and decision-making obtained the highest rating from school administrators (GWM = 4.83), indicating a strong belief in their ability to provide direction, make timely decisions, and maintain accountability during crisis situations. This finding highlights the central role of school leaders in ensuring effective crisis response and reinforces the importance of decisive leadership in maintaining school safety and operational continuity during emergencies.

Similarly, preparedness and planning received a high rating from both groups, with administrators rating it at 4.78 and teachers at 4.14. The results suggest that schools have established crisis management plans and preparedness mechanisms that are generally recognized by stakeholders. The relatively high ratings indicate that preparedness planning has become an integral component of school operations, contributing to the readiness of schools to respond to potential emergencies and disasters.

The dimension of communication management was also positively assessed, with administrators giving a grand weighted mean of 4.75 and teachers 3.98. Effective communication is essential during crises because it facilitates the timely dissemination of information and coordination among stakeholders. Although both groups acknowledged the presence of communication systems, the comparatively lower teacher rating may indicate opportunities to further strengthen communication channels and ensure that critical information reaches all stakeholders promptly and consistently.

In terms of training and capacity building, administrators and teachers reported positive assessments, with grand weighted means of 4.75 and 3.94, respectively. The findings suggest that schools regularly conduct preparedness activities such as drills, simulations, and related training programs. However, the lower teacher assessment implies that some teachers may perceive existing training opportunities as insufficient to fully equip them with the knowledge and skills required for effective crisis response. This highlights the need for continuous professional development initiatives focused on crisis and disaster management.

Finally, safety and recovery management received the lowest ratings among the five dimensions, although both groups still assessed it positively. Administrators reported a grand weighted mean of 4.73, while teachers reported 3.98. The findings indicate that schools place considerable emphasis on ensuring the immediate safety of learners and personnel during emergencies. However, the relatively lower ratings suggest that recovery-related initiatives, such as psychological support, well-being monitoring, and learning continuity measures, may require further strengthening to support stakeholders in the aftermath of crisis events.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that crisis management strategies are implemented at a high level across schools in the district. The consistently positive assessments from both administrators and teachers indicate the presence of established systems and practices that support school safety and preparedness. Nevertheless, the variation in ratings between the two groups suggests the importance of strengthening collaboration, communication, and capacity-building efforts to ensure that crisis management initiatives are fully understood, experienced, and supported by all members of the school community.

Table 3. Summary of the Level of School Disaster Preparedness as Perceived by School Administrators and Teachers

Dimension	School Administrators (GWM)	Interpretation	Teachers (GWM)	Interpretation
Disaster Preparedness Planning	4.73	Highly Prepared	3.69	Moderately Prepared
Organizational Structure and Roles	4.80	Highly Prepared	3.78	Moderately Prepared
Capacity Building and Training	4.77	Highly Prepared	3.65	Moderately Prepared
Early Warning and Communication Systems	4.75	Highly Prepared	3.57	Moderately Prepared
Safety Measures and Resources	4.57	Highly Prepared	3.66	Moderately Prepared
Grand Mean	4.72	Highly Prepared	3.67	Moderately Prepared

Table 3 presents the summary of the level of school disaster preparedness as perceived by school administrator-respondents and teacher-respondents. The findings reveal a notable difference in perceptions between the two groups. School administrators assessed the overall level of school disaster preparedness as Highly Prepared (GWM = 4.72), whereas teachers assessed it as only Moderately Prepared (GWM = 3.67). This disparity suggests that while school leaders perceive disaster preparedness measures as being comprehensively implemented, teachers may experience or observe gaps in the actual execution, accessibility, or effectiveness of these preparedness initiatives within the school setting.

Among the dimensions, organizational structure and roles obtained the highest rating from school administrators (GWM = 4.80), indicating a strong belief that roles, responsibilities, and response mechanisms during emergencies are clearly defined and well-established. This finding reflects administrators' confidence in the organizational arrangements designed to facilitate effective disaster response and coordination. Clear role delineation is essential in emergency situations because it minimizes confusion and enables stakeholders to respond promptly and efficiently.

Similarly, capacity building and training received a high assessment from administrators (GWM = 4.77), suggesting that schools regularly conduct drills, simulations, and other preparedness activities. These initiatives are important because they enhance the knowledge, skills, and readiness of school personnel to respond effectively during emergencies. However, teachers provided a lower rating (GWM = 3.65), indicating that they may perceive existing training opportunities as insufficient or not consistently accessible. This finding highlights the need to strengthen teacher participation in disaster preparedness activities and provide more comprehensive training programs.

The dimension of disaster preparedness planning also received contrasting assessments. Administrators rated it as highly prepared (GWM = 4.73), reflecting confidence in the existence and regular updating of School Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM) Plans. Teachers, however, rated this dimension as moderately prepared (GWM = 3.69), suggesting that although planning mechanisms exist, teacher involvement in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of disaster preparedness activities may be limited. This discrepancy underscores the importance of promoting greater stakeholder participation in preparedness planning processes.

A similar pattern emerged in early warning and communication systems, where administrators reported a high level of preparedness (GWM = 4.75), while teachers perceived only moderate preparedness (GWM = 3.57). The relatively lower teacher rating suggests concerns regarding the timeliness, consistency, and effectiveness of communication during emergencies. Since effective communication serves as the foundation of coordinated disaster response, this finding points to the need for improving communication channels, alert systems, and coordination mechanisms among school personnel and external stakeholders.

Lastly, safety measures and resources obtained the lowest rating among administrators (GWM = 4.57) and remained at a moderate level among teachers (GWM = 3.66). Although both groups acknowledged the presence of safety protocols, drills, and emergency resources, the findings indicate that certain aspects—particularly evacuation signage, safety infrastructure, and compliance with safety procedures—may require further enhancement. The lower ratings in this area suggest that schools should continue investing in physical preparedness measures and resource availability to strengthen overall disaster readiness.

Overall, the findings indicate that schools in the district have established important disaster preparedness mechanisms; however, significant differences exist between administrator and teacher perceptions. The consistently higher ratings provided by administrators suggest confidence in the policies and systems that have been put in place, while the more conservative ratings from teachers may reflect challenges encountered during implementation. These results highlight the need to strengthen stakeholder engagement, enhance training opportunities, improve communication systems, and ensure that preparedness initiatives are fully experienced and understood by all members of the school community. Such efforts will contribute to a more comprehensive and sustainable approach to school disaster preparedness.

Table 4. Summary of the Significant Difference Between the Assessments of School Administrators and Teachers on Crisis Management Strategies and School Disaster Preparedness

Variable	Dimension	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Crisis Management Strategies	Preparedness and Planning	0.000011	Reject Ho	Significant
	Leadership and Decision-Making	0.000005	Reject Ho	Significant
	Communication Management	0.000002	Reject Ho	Significant
	Training and Capability Building	0.000008	Reject Ho	Significant
	Safety and Recovery Management	0.000040	Reject Ho	Significant
School Disaster Preparedness	Disaster Preparedness Planning	0.000001	Reject Ho	Significant
	Organizational Structure and Roles	0.000000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Capacity Building and Training	0.000000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Early Warning and Communication Systems	0.000000	Reject Ho	Significant
	Safety Measures and Resources	0.000000	Reject Ho	Significant

Level of Significance = 0.05

Table 4 presents the results of the test of significant difference between the assessments of school administrators and teachers regarding the implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster

preparedness. The findings show that all computed p-values were lower than the 0.05 level of significance, leading to the rejection of the null hypotheses in all dimensions examined.

The significant differences observed between administrators and teachers may be explained by organizational, communication, and leadership factors. School administrators are directly involved in developing preparedness plans, coordinating resources, and monitoring implementation. Consequently, they possess greater awareness of the existence of policies, procedures, and preparedness mechanisms. Teachers, however, often evaluate preparedness based on their direct experiences with drills, training activities, communication systems, and available resources. As a result, they may perceive implementation gaps that are not readily apparent to administrators.

The findings may also indicate varying levels of stakeholder participation in preparedness initiatives. While preparedness mechanisms may formally exist, teachers may not always be sufficiently involved in planning, decision-making, monitoring, and evaluation activities. Limited participation can reduce ownership, awareness, and confidence in disaster preparedness programs, thereby contributing to lower assessments.

From a leadership perspective, the results suggest the possible presence of a predominantly top-down approach to crisis management implementation. Although such an approach may facilitate administrative efficiency, it may not fully promote shared understanding and collective preparedness among school personnel. Strengthening participatory leadership practices and collaborative decision-making may help reduce perceptual gaps and foster a stronger culture of preparedness throughout the school community.

These findings support Organizational Resilience Theory, which emphasizes that organizational preparedness depends not only on formal structures and procedures but also on shared understanding, communication, and stakeholder engagement. Schools that cultivate collaborative preparedness cultures are more likely to achieve consistent perceptions and stronger disaster readiness outcomes.

Table 5. Summary of the Significant Relationship Between the Profile of School Administrators and the Study Variables

Profile Variable	Crisis Management Strategies	School Disaster Preparedness
Age	Not Significant	Not Significant
Sex	Not Significant	Not Significant
Civil Status	Not Significant	Not Significant
Highest Educational Attainment	Not Significant	Not Significant
Number of Years as School Administrator	Not Significant	Not Significant
Position/Designation	Not Significant	Not Significant
Relevant In-Service Trainings	Not Significant	Not Significant
Performance Rating (Latest OPCR)	Not Significant	Not Significant
Attitude Toward Crisis Management	Significant ($\rho = 0.511$, $p = 0.050$)	Significant ($\rho = 0.468$, $p = 0.049$)

Level of Significance = 0.05

Table 5 presents the results of the test of significant relationship between the profile variables of the school administrator-respondents and their assessed level of implementation of crisis management strategies as well as their assessed level of school disaster preparedness.

The findings reveal that among the profile variables examined, only attitude toward crisis management demonstrated a significant relationship with both crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness. Specifically, attitude toward crisis management showed a moderate positive correlation with the level of implementation of crisis management strategies ($\rho = 0.511$, $p = 0.050$) and with the level of school disaster

preparedness ($p = 0.468$, $p = 0.049$). These results indicate that school administrators who possess more positive attitudes toward crisis management are more likely to perceive higher levels of implementation of crisis-related strategies and greater levels of school disaster preparedness.

This finding highlights the critical role of attitude as an influential factor in promoting effective crisis management practices. Administrators who strongly value preparedness, risk reduction, and emergency planning are more likely to support, prioritize, and actively participate in initiatives that strengthen school readiness and resilience. Their positive disposition toward crisis management may also influence organizational culture by encouraging greater awareness, commitment, and participation among school personnel in preparedness activities.

In contrast, the results indicate that age, sex, civil status, highest educational attainment, number of years as school administrator, position or designation, relevant in-service trainings, and performance rating based on the latest OPCRf did not show significant relationships with either crisis management strategies or school disaster preparedness. This suggests that demographic and professional characteristics alone do not necessarily determine the extent to which administrators implement crisis management practices or perceive their schools as prepared for disasters.

The significant influence of attitude toward crisis management supports Protection Motivation Theory, which suggests that positive beliefs regarding preparedness and risk reduction encourage proactive preparedness behaviors. School administrators who recognize the value of preparedness are more likely to prioritize crisis management activities, support disaster risk reduction initiatives, and encourage active participation among school personnel. Consequently, positive attitudes contribute to stronger implementation of crisis management strategies and improved preparedness outcomes.

Overall, the findings imply that while professional qualifications and experience remain important in school leadership, the attitudes of administrators toward crisis management play a more significant role in influencing preparedness efforts. Strengthening positive attitudes through continuous awareness programs, leadership development activities, and capacity-building initiatives may therefore contribute to more effective crisis management implementation and improved school disaster preparedness.

Table 6. Relationship Between Crisis Management Strategies and School Disaster Preparedness

Dimension of School Disaster Preparedness	Correlation Coefficient (ρ)	p-value	Interpretation
Disaster Preparedness Planning	0.853	0.000	Very Strong Positive Correlation
Organizational Structure and Roles	0.829	0.000	Very Strong Positive Correlation
Capacity Building and Training	0.911	0.000	Very Strong Positive Correlation
Early Warning and Communication Systems	0.908	0.000	Very Strong Positive Correlation
Safety Measures and Resources	0.737	0.002	Strong Positive Correlation

Level of Significance = 0.05

Table 6 presents the relationship between the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness. The findings reveal that all dimensions of school disaster preparedness were significantly and positively correlated with crisis management strategies, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Among the dimensions, capacity building and training exhibited the strongest relationship with crisis management strategies ($\rho = 0.911$, $p = 0.000$), followed closely by early warning and communication systems ($\rho = 0.908$, $p = 0.000$). These very strong positive correlations indicate that schools with more effective crisis management practices tend to have stronger training programs and more efficient communication systems for disaster preparedness. This finding emphasizes the importance of equipping school personnel with the necessary knowledge, skills, and communication mechanisms to respond effectively during emergencies.

Likewise, disaster preparedness planning ($\rho = 0.853$, $p = 0.000$) and organizational structure and roles ($\rho = 0.829$, $p = 0.000$) demonstrated very strong positive correlations with crisis management strategies. These results suggest that schools that actively implement crisis management measures are more likely to establish comprehensive preparedness plans, clearly define responsibilities, and maintain organized response structures. Such elements are essential for ensuring coordinated and effective actions before, during, and after disaster events.

Meanwhile, safety measures and resources showed a strong positive correlation ($\rho = 0.737$, $p = 0.002$). Although this relationship was slightly lower than the other dimensions, it nevertheless indicates that effective crisis management contributes substantially to the availability and implementation of safety protocols, emergency resources, and protective measures within schools.

The consistently high correlation coefficients across all dimensions demonstrate that crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness are closely interconnected. As the implementation of crisis management strategies improves, corresponding improvements in disaster preparedness are also likely to occur. These findings affirm that crisis management serves as a foundational component of school preparedness and resilience.

The strong positive relationships observed between crisis management strategies and disaster preparedness provide empirical support for Organizational Resilience Theory. The findings suggest that preparedness planning, leadership, communication, training, and recovery mechanisms function collectively to strengthen institutional resilience. Schools that demonstrate stronger crisis management capacities are better positioned to develop effective preparedness systems, enhance response capabilities, and sustain educational continuity during emergencies.

Overall, the results underscore the importance of strengthening crisis management strategies as a means of enhancing school disaster preparedness. Investments in preparedness planning, leadership, communication systems, training programs, and safety measures are likely to yield significant improvements in the overall readiness of schools to prevent, respond to, and recover from emergencies and disasters.

Table 7. Challenges Encountered by School Administrators in the Implementation of Crisis Management Strategies

Indicator	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
Limited funding hinders disaster preparedness.	4.87	Highly a Challenge
Emergency supplies are insufficient.	4.87	Highly a Challenge
Coordination with local authorities is difficult.	4.60	Highly a Challenge
Grand Weighted Mean	4.76	Highly a Challenge

Table 7 presents the challenges encountered by school administrator-respondents in the implementation of crisis management strategies. The findings reveal that the overall level of challenges experienced by the respondents was highly evident, as reflected in the grand weighted mean of 4.76, interpreted as Highly a Challenge. This indicates that school administrators consistently encounter significant obstacles that may affect the effective implementation of crisis management initiatives and disaster preparedness programs within their schools.

Among the identified challenges, limited funding for disaster preparedness and insufficient emergency supplies emerged as the most significant concerns, both obtaining the highest weighted mean of 4.87. These findings underscore the critical role of financial and material resources in ensuring the successful implementation of crisis management strategies. Adequate funding is necessary to support preparedness activities, procure emergency equipment, conduct training programs, and maintain disaster response mechanisms. Likewise, the availability of emergency supplies is essential for providing immediate assistance and protection during crisis situations. The prominence of these challenges suggests that resource constraints remain a major barrier to achieving optimal school disaster preparedness.

On the other hand, coordination with local authorities obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.60. Although ranked lowest among the identified challenges, it was still interpreted as Highly a Challenge, indicating that collaboration with external agencies continues to present difficulties for school administrators. Effective coordination with local government units and disaster risk reduction and management offices is crucial for accessing technical support, emergency resources, and timely information during emergencies. The result suggests that while coordination issues may be less severe than funding and resource limitations, they nevertheless require attention to strengthen partnerships and improve disaster response efforts.

Overall, the findings indicate that the challenges encountered by school administrators are primarily related to resource inadequacies and logistical support. These constraints may limit the capacity of schools to fully implement crisis management strategies and maintain a high level of disaster preparedness. Addressing these concerns through increased funding allocations, improved provision of emergency resources, and strengthened inter-agency collaboration may significantly enhance the effectiveness of crisis management practices in schools.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This study determined the crisis management strategies and their impact on school disaster preparedness in the District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar, during the School Year 2025–2026.

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, the following findings were obtained:

1. The school administrator-respondents were predominantly female, married, and within the 37–41 age bracket. Most were Master's Degree Holders, had served as school administrators for 6–10 years, and held the position of Head Teacher I. They frequently participated in school-level in-service trainings and all obtained Outstanding performance ratings based on their latest OPCR. Furthermore, the respondents demonstrated a very high positive attitude toward crisis management, indicating strong support for preparedness, communication, policy enhancement, and continuous improvement in managing school crises.
2. The level of implementation of crisis management strategies, as assessed by school administrators, was very high across all dimensions. Leadership and decision-making emerged as the most evident dimension, followed by preparedness and planning, communication management, training and capability building, and safety and recovery management. These findings suggest that school administrators perceived crisis management practices as being effectively implemented in their respective schools.
3. Teacher-respondents likewise perceived the implementation of crisis management strategies to be evident across all dimensions. Preparedness and planning obtained the highest assessment, followed by leadership and decision-making, communication management, safety and recovery management, and training and capability building. Although teachers generally acknowledged the implementation of crisis management practices, their ratings were consistently lower than those of school administrators.
4. School administrators assessed the level of school disaster preparedness as highly prepared across all dimensions. Organizational structure and roles obtained the highest rating, followed by capacity building and training, early warning and communication systems, disaster preparedness planning, and safety

measures and resources. These findings indicate that administrators viewed their schools as having well-established systems and mechanisms for disaster preparedness.

5. Teacher-respondents assessed the level of school disaster preparedness as moderately prepared across all dimensions. Organizational structure and roles received the highest rating, followed by disaster preparedness planning, safety measures and resources, capacity building and training, and early warning and communication systems. These results suggest that while preparedness measures were present, teachers perceived opportunities for further improvement in several areas of school disaster readiness.
6. Significant differences existed between the assessments of school administrators and teachers regarding the implementation of crisis management strategies. Significant differences were observed in preparedness and planning, leadership and decision-making, communication management, training and capability building, and safety and recovery management. These findings indicate that the two groups differed in their perceptions of how extensively crisis management strategies were implemented within their schools.
7. Significant differences were likewise found between the assessments of school administrators and teachers regarding school disaster preparedness. Significant differences were observed in disaster preparedness planning, organizational structure and roles, capacity building and training, early warning and communication systems, and safety measures and resources. These results indicate that administrators and teachers perceived the level of school disaster preparedness differently.
8. Among the profile variables of school administrators, only attitude toward crisis management demonstrated a significant positive relationship with both the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness. Other profile variables such as age, sex, civil status, educational attainment, administrative experience, position, relevant trainings, and performance rating showed no significant relationships with either variable.
9. A significant positive relationship existed between the level of implementation of crisis management strategies and the level of school disaster preparedness. Very strong positive correlations were found in disaster preparedness planning, organizational structure and roles, capacity building and training, and early warning and communication systems, while a strong positive correlation was observed in safety measures and resources. These findings indicate that higher levels of crisis management implementation were associated with higher levels of school disaster preparedness.
10. School administrators encountered considerable challenges in implementing crisis management strategies. Limited funding for disaster preparedness and insufficient emergency supplies emerged as the most significant challenges, while difficulties in coordinating with local authorities were also identified. Overall, the respondents perceived these challenges as highly evident, highlighting the need for enhanced resource allocation and stronger support mechanisms to improve crisis management and disaster preparedness efforts in schools.
11. The findings of this study should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, the study relied primarily on self-reported perceptions of school administrators and teachers, which may be influenced by personal biases and subjective interpretations. Second, the number of school administrator respondents was relatively small ($n = 15$), which may limit statistical power and the generalizability of the findings. Third, the study utilized perception-based indicators of preparedness and did not incorporate objective measures such as DRRM compliance reports, infrastructure audits, emergency drill performance records, preparedness checklists, or observational assessments. Finally, the cross-sectional nature of the study limits the ability to establish causal relationships among the variables examined. Future research should address these limitations through larger samples, mixed-methods approaches, and the inclusion of objective preparedness indicators.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that school administrators in the District of San Jose de Buan possess favorable professional characteristics and demonstrate a strong positive attitude toward crisis management. Their positive disposition toward preparedness, communication, leadership, and continuous improvement contributes significantly to the implementation of crisis management strategies and the enhancement of school disaster preparedness.

The study revealed that crisis management strategies were implemented at a high level across the dimensions of preparedness and planning, leadership and decision-making, communication management, training and capability building, and safety and recovery management. Likewise, school disaster preparedness was generally perceived as highly evident by school administrators and moderately evident by teachers. These findings indicate that schools have established mechanisms and structures intended to strengthen preparedness and resilience against various emergencies and disasters.

However, the significant differences between the assessments of school administrators and teachers regarding both crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness suggest that preparedness initiatives are not uniformly experienced or perceived by all stakeholders. While administrators generally viewed implementation and preparedness more favorably, teachers reported comparatively lower levels of assessment, indicating possible gaps in communication, participation, awareness, or actual implementation at the operational level.

The study further established that among the profile variables considered, only attitude toward crisis management significantly influenced both the implementation of crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness. This finding highlights the importance of cultivating positive attitudes, commitment, and proactive leadership among school administrators in promoting a culture of preparedness and safety.

Moreover, the strong and significant relationships between crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness affirm that effective implementation of preparedness planning, leadership practices, communication systems, training programs, and recovery mechanisms contributes substantially to improving schools' readiness for disasters and emergencies. Thus, strengthening crisis management practices directly enhances overall disaster preparedness.

Despite the generally positive findings, school administrators continue to face significant challenges, particularly limited funding and insufficient emergency supplies. These constraints hinder the effective implementation of crisis management initiatives and may limit the capacity of schools to respond efficiently during emergencies. Therefore, successful school disaster preparedness requires not only effective leadership and positive attitudes but also adequate resources, institutional support, stakeholder collaboration, and sustained capacity-building efforts. Addressing these factors will contribute to safer, more resilient, and disaster-prepared schools.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. School administrators should strengthen the implementation of crisis management strategies by regularly reviewing and updating school disaster preparedness plans, ensuring that these remain responsive to emerging risks and changing school contexts.
2. Teachers should be more actively involved in crisis management planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation activities to promote shared responsibility and improve consistency in the perception and practice of disaster preparedness measures.
3. Schools should intensify training programs, simulation exercises, emergency drills, and capacity-building activities to enhance the preparedness competencies of both administrators and teachers.

4. School leaders should establish more effective communication systems and feedback mechanisms to ensure that all stakeholders clearly understand crisis management policies, procedures, and emergency response protocols.
5. The Schools Division Office should provide continuous technical assistance and professional development programs focusing on crisis management, disaster risk reduction, emergency leadership, and school safety planning.
6. Local government units, disaster risk reduction and management offices, and other partner agencies should strengthen collaboration with schools by providing technical support, emergency resources, and assistance in preparedness planning and response activities.
7. Adequate funding should be allocated for disaster preparedness programs, emergency equipment, safety facilities, and essential supplies to address the resource limitations identified by school administrators.
8. Schools should establish sustainable resource mobilization initiatives and partnerships with community stakeholders to augment emergency supplies and strengthen preparedness efforts.
9. Regular monitoring and assessment of crisis management strategies and school disaster preparedness should be conducted to identify strengths, address gaps, and ensure continuous improvement in preparedness practices.
10. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other districts or divisions using larger populations and additional variables to further validate the findings. Qualitative or mixed-methods approaches may likewise be employed to gain deeper insights into stakeholders' experiences, perceptions, and challenges related to crisis management and school disaster preparedness.
11. The Schools Division Office may institutionalize resilience-based leadership development programs focusing on crisis leadership, organizational resilience, risk communication, and emergency decision-making.
12. Schools should adopt a whole-school approach to disaster preparedness by actively involving teachers, learners, parents, community members, and partner agencies in preparedness planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation activities.
13. Future researchers should employ mixed-methods designs that combine quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews, focus group discussions, and document analysis to obtain a deeper understanding of preparedness processes.
14. Future studies should incorporate objective preparedness indicators such as DRRM compliance reports, infrastructure safety audits, emergency drill performance records, preparedness checklists, hazard assessments, and observational measures to strengthen the validity of findings.
15. Future studies should report effect sizes, confidence intervals, and nonparametric statistical analyses to provide stronger evidence regarding the practical significance and robustness of research findings.

REFERENCES

1. Coombs, W. T. (2021). *Ongoing crisis communication: Planning, managing, and responding* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
2. Department of Education. (2015). DepEd Order No. 37, s. 2015: The comprehensive disaster risk reduction and management (DRRM) in basic education framework. Department of Education, Philippines. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>

3. Department of Education. (2023). Schools Division disaster risk reduction and management implementation report. Schools Division of Samar. [Unpublished divisional report].
4. District Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Committee. (2024). District DRRM monitoring and assessment report for School Year 2023–2024. District of San Jose de Buan, Schools Division of Samar. [Unpublished district report].
5. Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13(1), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
6. Harris, A., Jones, M., & Hashim, N. (2021). System leaders and system leadership: Exploring the contemporary evidence base. *School Leadership & Management*, 41(4–5), 387–408. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2021.1889492>
7. Horton, D., Spigelmyer, P., Zoucha, R., & Rebmann, T. (2023). Disaster preparedness in K–12 schools: An integrative review. *Journal of School Health*, 93(8), 726–732. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josh.13319>
8. Kaim, A., Siman-Tov, M., Adini, B., & Lev-Ari, S. (2023). An innovative tool to assess the functional resilience of a school system: Learning from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1264202. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1264202>
9. Lengnick-Hall, C. A., Beck, T. E., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Developing a capacity for organizational resilience through strategic human resource management. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21(3), 243–255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.07.001>
10. Maddux, J. E., & Rogers, R. W. (1983). Protection motivation and self-efficacy: A revised theory of fear appeals and attitude change. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19(5), 469–479. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031\(83\)90023-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(83)90023-9)
11. McLeod, S., & Dulskey, S. (2021). Resilience, reorientation, and reinvention: School leadership during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 637075. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.637075>
12. Mutch, C. (2020). The role of schools in disaster preparedness, response, and recovery: What can we learn from the literature? *Pastoral Care in Education*, 38(4), 309–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02643944.2020.1788125>
13. Paton, D. (2020). Disaster risk reduction and resilience: The role of individual and community preparedness. In D. Paton & D. M. Johnston (Eds.), *Disaster resilience: An integrated approach* (3rd ed., pp. 45–66). Charles C Thomas Publisher.
14. Qian, H., & Walker, A. (2022). Understanding educational leadership during times of crises: A scoping review. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 25(4), 630–648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2021.1909053>
15. Republic of the Philippines. (2010). Republic Act No. 10121: Philippine Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act of 2010. *Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines*. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph>
16. Reyes-Guerra, D., Maslin-Ostrowski, P., Barakat, M. Y., & Stefanovic, M. A. (2021). Confronting a compound crisis: The school principal's role during the initial phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Education*, 6, Article 617875. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2021.617875>
17. Rogers, R. W. (1983). Cognitive and physiological processes in fear appeals and attitude change: A revised theory of protection motivation. In J. T. Cacioppo & R. E. Petty (Eds.), *Social psychophysiology: A sourcebook* (pp. 153–176). Guilford Press.
18. Tafti, A. D., Roudini, J., Eftekhari, A., Khankeh, H., Fallah-Aliabadi, S., & Ahmadi, S. (2020). School resilience components in disasters and emergencies: A systematic review. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 47, 101632. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2020.101632>
19. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *From disruption to recovery: Education in a post-COVID world*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://www.unesco.org>
20. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. (2023). *Comprehensive school safety framework 2022–2030*. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction. <https://www.undrr.org>