ASEAN Journal of Science and Engineering Education

Journal homepage: http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/AJSEE/

Public School Performance vis-à-vis Safety and Readiness: An Assessment

Alican Mendez Pandapatan

Mindanao State University, Marawi, The Philippines
Correspondence: E-mail: alican.pandapatan@msumain.edu.ph

ABSTRACT

Safety and readiness are the primary basis for stakeholders to determine security and for conducive teaching-learning. The study focused on assessing the performances of selected public schools. Five schools have participated in this study. A survey questionnaire was distributed to gather the data. The design used is a descriptive method. Three objectives were specified in this study, and these are identifying the respondents' demographic profile, rating the level of school performance in terms of safety and readiness, and comparing the significant difference in the school performance with the respondents' demographic profile. It is revealed in the research that the respondents are diverse when it comes to their age, sex, length of service, field of study, and training attended related to safety. Among the school performance indicators, health protocols are rated high by the respondents. Their response is adaptive to the Covid 19 pandemic. The study also revealed that there is no significant difference in school performance perceived when grouped according to demographic profile, however, the level of training of the respondents influences the perceived performance of their schools which indicates significance. School safety and readiness are implemented through the good leadership of school administrators and sending teachers to training to develop skills and more critical observation in the school performance.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Submitted/Received 29 Apr 2023
First Revised 12 May 2023
Accepted 02 Jul 2023
First Available online 03 Jul 2023
Publication Date 01 Sep 2024

Keyword:
Assessment,
Demographic profile,
Readiness,
Safety,
School performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

The ASEAN schools need to implement safety interventions for sustainability, structured operationalization as a guide for the start-up and monitoring, and assess their initiatives in the time frame. Ranging from the perspective regionally and globally, the school safety and readiness outcomes exhibit commonalities that are used for monitoring and gaps to reflect on the regional and national achievements.

The Philippines, as part of the ASEAN community, enacted a law called the Republic Act No. 10121 to put emphasis and strict observation on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management (DRRM). The Department of Education (DepEd) as a government agency administering the basic education of the country adheres to the abovementioned law by releasing the DepEd Order No. 50, s. 2011 to create DRRM office, DepEd Order No. 83, s. 2011 contains prepared measures for schools, and DepEd Order No. 33, s. 2021 roles and responsibilities of DepEd offices in supporting school-based disaster preparedness and response measure. With this, the schools are guided and monitored by officials to ensure safety and readiness are achieved.

The status of the Philippines as a third high risks country when it comes to disaster with an index of 25.14 % in a report in 2018 impacted a significant number of lives and properties. This is rooted in the primary fact that the country is situated within the "Pacific Ring of Fire". The archipelagic composition of the country also adds a variety of threats to safety as both natural hazards and human-induced hazards brought harm to the community particularly the school premises . Given the geographical set-up of the Philippines, different areas have feature-specific hazards and risks for instance the typhoon does mostly affect the southern part of Luzon and the Eastern part of the Visayan Islands (Santos, 2021). The truth of this matter pushed the serious action and adoption of DRRM (Manuel and Gelido, 2021). Whenever catastrophic events occur, planning the safety of every constituent is desired which also signifies the school's readiness. This entails the performance of the school.

Administrators of DepEd conduct ocular inspections to monitor the school's efficiency in response to the appertaining laws and orders at the same time the compliance of the school with the standard safety. One major activity carried out by DepEd is the monitoring of schools during Brigada Eskwela (Olaivar and Pobar, 2017). This activity is the school preparation before the start of the academic year to check different indicators of safety and readiness for opening have made. Though this activity does not only done before the opening of the class it is also a whole-year-round activity. This has become an essential part of the school improvement plan (SIP). Some studies such as Macher (2014) and Bacus (2020) revealed the low management in the preparation of disasters in schools. Mirzaei *et al*. (2020) and Cabilao-Valencia *et al*. (2018) made mention in their study what a resilient school is. They stressed that a resilient school constructs risk management and assessment based on the improvement plan created. Meanwhile, in the conduct of this preparedness, teachers are the central agents in employing the plans and directly influence the school's performance. Due to this, the level of school performance is important to monitor through the perceived level of compliance by the teachers.

This study sought to assess the school performance in the aspect of safety and readiness in selected public schools. To address this, three statements of the problem are made:

(i) What is the demographic profile of the teachers in terms of age, sex, length of service, field of specialization, and level of training?
(ii) What is the level of school performance in terms of safety and readiness?

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

(iii) Is there a significant difference in the school performance perceived by respondents when grouped according to their demographic profile?

(iv) The last statement is being hypothesized in this study that: H_0: there is no significant difference in the school performance perceived by respondents according to their profile in terms of age, sex, length of service, field of specialization, and level of training.

As this study tackles the given queries, school performance vis-à-vis safety and readiness can be of importance in looking at its contribution to the usual conception of school performance in most of the literature such as achievement tests, promotion rate, and others.

2. METHODS

2.1. Design

The study used descriptive-correlational to explain the school performance and through correlating one variable to another equally important variable in the study.

2.2. Respondents and Sampling Design

A complete enumeration within the targeted schools is the sampling used. The respondents were teachers of the studied schools holding different subject areas. The schools were all secondary schools.

2.3. Ethical Consideration

The researcher gave a consent form to the respondent. This explained the purpose of the study at the same time in assuring the confidentiality and privacy of their identity in this research.

2.4. Instrument

The study used a survey form that underwent a validity and reliability test.

2.5. Data Gathering

The researcher submits an intention letter to the head of the schools to ask permission to conduct the study. The instrument was distributed to the respondents together with the consent form to give the option to the respondents to answer or not the survey form. While administering the collection of data, the researcher had a casual interview with the focal person of each school about their perceived performance and their level of implementation from the various areas of DRRM. However, the research does not focus on the areas of DRRM but it still matters to the perceived safety and readiness in school.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section shows the results of the study conducted and the discussions on the findings using tables. The demographic profiles of the respondents are presented first, the school's performance based on the indicators comes second, and lastly, the correlation of the school's performance on safety and readiness and demographic profile.

3.1. Demographic Profile of The Teachers in Terms of Age, Sex, Length of Service, Field of Specialization, and Level of Training

Results described that 40.7% of the sampled teachers belong to 30-39 years of age, 23.5% of them are under the age bracket of 50-59 years, 17.3% of them belong to 20-29 years of age and only 4.9% of them were 60-65 years of age (see **Table 1**).

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

When this is arranged in order from the number groups to least, young adults would be the most in number followed by middle-aged adults and old adults respectively. Regardless of the age bracket where the respondents belonged assume does not affect their ability and difference in understanding the concept of DRRM as Tuladhar *et al*. (2015) that all age brackets between low and above forty have a similar understanding of DRR significance.

Table 1. Age profile of the teachers.

Age (in years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
20-29	14	17.3
30-39	33	40.7
40-49	11	13.6
50-59	19	23.5
60-65	4	4.9
Total	81	100.0

It shows that 24.7 % are male respondents and there are 75.3% female respondents in the group. Manuel & Gelido (2021) stressed that in the teaching profession, female dominates the field. However, this dominancy does not emphasize equal distribution coming from both sexes (see **Table 2**).

Table 2. Sex profile of the teachers.

Sex	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	20	24.7
Female	61	75.3
Total	81	100.0

It tells that 11.1% sampled group has less than a year in the public school or was newly accepted in the service in DepEd, 14.8% have served between 1-4 years, 30.9% have served for at least 5-9 years, 7.4% has a length of stay of 10-14 years, 7.4% able to render 15-19 years in the system, 9.9% has served the system around 20-24 years, 13.6% has served around 25-29 years, and 4.9% has rendered long about 30-34 years in the public school (see **Table 3**).

The years of service of teachers do not significantly differ from the least experience and experienced teachers in the service. As these years of experience from the respondents, it implies that teachers must not be classified as knowledgeable on a certain matter by basing their service years.

The results show that 13.6% of English teachers were among the respondents, 12.3% Filipino teachers also the percentage of the respondents from this area, 12.3% Mathematics teachers who are also the same percentage as the precedent group, 18.5% is Science teachers, 13.6% is Araling Panlipunan teachers, and lastly, 18.5% is T.L.E teachers. There are less than 10 respondents in another field as such there are 2.5% Values Education teachers, 6.2% MAPEH teachers, 2.5% specializing in another field, and no Religion teacher as a respondent (see **Table 4**).

Canlas (2019) argues that DRRM in the Philippines is fused with the subject in science while other countries integrate it into physical education, exploring which subject would best teach the DRRM is not evident and studied. the DRRM is not only integrated into science in the K to 12 Curriculum in the country but it is offered as a separate subject. However, this is exclusive to general academic track and STEM students.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

Table 3. Length of service profile of the teachers.

Length of Service	Frequency	Percentage (%)
less than 1	9	11.1
1-4	12	14.8
5-9	25	30.9
10-14	6	7.4
15-19	6	7.4
20-24	8	9.9
25-29	11	13.6
30-34	4	4.9
Total	**81**	**100.0**

Table 4. Field of specialization of the teachers.

Field of Specialization	Frequency	Percentage (%)
English	11	13.6
Filipino	10	12.3
Mathematics	10	12.3
Science	15	18.5
Araling Panlipunan	11	13.6
Technology and Livelihood Education (T.L.E)	15	18.5
Values Education	2	2.5
Music, Arts, Physical Education and Health (MAPEH)	5	6.2
religion (e.g., ALIVE)	0	0.0
Others	2	2.5
Total	81	100.0

The result described that 59.3% do not have DRRM training. 24.7% revealed that have DRRM training at the school level. 1.2% had district-level training on DRRM. There 9.9% of respondents underwent a Division or city-wide training. No one had regional-level training. At the national level, there is 1.2% able to attend national training. Regis (2020) expressed that training has significance to the implementation of the program especially on the number of training they are exposed to (see **Table 5**).

Table 5. Level of DRRM training of the teachers.

Level of DRRM Training	Frequency	Percentage (%)
None	48	59.3
School	20	24.7
District	1	1.2
Division/City	8	9.9
Regional	0	0.0
National	1	1.2
International	3	3.7
Total	81	100.0

3.2. Level of the School Performance in Terms of Safety and Readiness

The Teachers gave the highest rate to their school performance on health protocols (M=4.14, SD=0.77). Among the criteria given, the lowest that teachers believe that their schools have not observed is the drainage systems (M=3.51, SD=0.90). However, this was

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

graded as very satisfactory. As a consequence of this rate, all items mentioned in the school performance on safety and readiness have been very satisfactory which is directly seen in an overall rate of very satisfactory. It is interpreted as attaining the majority of the criteria stipulated (see **Table 6**).

Table 6. Level of school performance in terms of safety and readiness.

Indicators	Mean ± SD	Description	Interpretation
1. Coordination with different school stakeholders	3.90±0.80	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
2. School DRRM Plan	3.73±0.77	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
3. School DRRM Committee	3.75±0.81	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
4. Preventive and school maintenance	3.69±0.80	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
5. Evacuation map and plan (e.g. entrance, exit, evacuation routes, evacuation room, etc.)	3.70±0.98	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
6. Safety Signages	3.78±0.96	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
7. Alarm systems and warning signs (floods, fire, earthquake, etc.)	3.68±0.86	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
8. Drainage systems	3.51±0.90	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
9. Communication Plan (emergency contacts, etc.)	3.78±0.92	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
10. Conduciveness for learning (includes but is not limited to child-friendly, pruned trees, etc.)	3.88±0.75	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
11. School Building and Electrical Wiring Evaluation	3.78±0.74	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
12. Classroom structuring/Service room structuring	3.96±0.83	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
13. Health Protocols	4.14±0.77	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
14. Facilities (e.g. clinic, isolation area, etc.)	3.90±0.77	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
15. Contingency Plan (Plan B)	3.90±0.78	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
16. Individual Identity Cards	3.74±0.88	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
17. List of most vulnerable individuals	3.60±0.85	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
18. Trained Individuals (teachers)	3.56±0.88	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
19. Campaign on disaster awareness among school constituents (teachers, students, and staff)	3.74±0.75	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
20. DRRM integration in subject areas	3.70±0.84	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
21. Available Resources (e.g. medicines, foods, supplies, etc.)	3.62±0.85	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
22. Security and Safety of school records and other school equipment	3.80±0.84	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
23. Different Drills for emergencies	3.74±0.77	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
24. Accommodation for the community (if necessary to evacuate in school)	3.89±0.87	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
25. Educational continuity (after an emergency)	3.79±0.85	*Very Satisfactory*	*High performance*
Total Measure	**3.77±0.65**	***Very Satisfactory***	***High performance***

Note:				
	1.00-1.80	Poor	3.41-4.20	Very Satisfactory
	1.81-2.60	Unsatisfactory	4.21-5.00	Outstanding
	2.61-3.40	Satisfactory		

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

Understanding the school's performance on safety and readiness would refer to items being implemented or worked on by the school. Coordination of the school with the other governmental units like barangay (the lowest unit of the local government which is only in the Philippines) is necessary to help the school prepare for the early warning, contingency plans, equipment reserve, communication, facilities, and evacuation plans (Abejuela *et al*, 2020). It is said that the schools are doing their part in coordinating with other stakeholders to promote the welfare of the school constituents. These stakeholders assist in in-kind forms to make sure that the best interest of schools to provide a safer environment is achieved. The schools have also their school DRRM committee which also follows the creation of the DRRM Plan that is applied. School prevention and maintenance are already part of why maintenance and other operating expenses (MOOE) are provided. Meaning, schools are expected to sustain cleanliness, structures, workflows, and other things related to maintenance to make school a safe space for everyone. An evacuation map is a requirement checked by the division office and local government unit (through the city/municipality engineer's office). Safety signage is a requirement in classrooms and all buildings in the schools have this because it allows people especially learners to be careful. Along with the signage, there are also alarm and warning systems used to notify people of the emergent situation. This is aligned with the school-based disaster preparedness measures mentioned in the DepEd namely; coordination with the local DRRM council, creating and updating the DRRM contingency plan, pruning trees that can cause damage to people and structures, governing annual risk assessment, removal of structures or items that obstruct the movement to the evacuation ground, and establish early warning systems.

The drainage system is necessary to avoid water flooding the ground. As it is gleaned in the table, it has the lowest rate. Nonetheless, teachers do observe the existence of drainage systems in their schools. Communication plan like emergency hotlines is also needed. It is appropriate to call the authority on certain events to facilitate in times of disaster-related problems occur. Conduciveness for learning is an item that talks about how the schools are child-friendly, war-free zone, nature-friendly, and others. For this, teachers think that their schools are conducive.

Evaluating school buildings and electrical wiring are two of the most valuable things checked by the authority to avoid the building collapsing or burning. Aside from this, the purpose of checking these aspects is to make sure the building is still useful, and the electric wires are functional. Classroom structuring is commonly termed by the teachers' classroom evaluation because it is done annually or twice a year. They have adapted to this kind of system. There is also a district evaluation so that the rooms can be beautiful and maintained. Health protocol is regarded as the highest among the items since this is the focus now of the schools due to the Covid 19 pandemic. There is a strict measure to follow when entering the campuses as required by the inter-agency task force (IATF). Aside from that, schools are also implementing health-related programs such as handwashing stations, comfort rooms, clinics, and others. The schools' governance in employing health programs has been seen as high among public schools (Acaylar & Reyes, 2021).

Facilities are also observed. The contingency plan or commonly known as plan B is believed as part of the disaster-related plan like the DRRM plan. Individual identity cards are released every beginning of the school year to identify who are the people allowed on the school premises. This is a way also to limit and protect everybody inside the campus. This is also used when something happened especially during retrieval operation, identity cards are the best primary source for the personal information of someone. Measures are commensurate to the preparedness measures namely; cleaning and clearing the drainage system, updating

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

emergency hotlines, conducting regular school DRRM programs, evaluating electrical lines, Removal of structures or items that obstruct the movement to evacuation ground, annual risk assessment, create and update DRRM contingency plan, and availability of updated baseline education data of the school.

Listing the vulnerable individuals among constituents like people with disability, senior citizen faculty, minors, and pregnant faculty are given privilege and attention when disasters come to play. It can easily track these people, especially in search, rescue, and retrieval (SRR). Trained individuals are said to be very satisfactory in the table. Training comes in different forms like drills, seminars, self-learning, etc.

Campaign on disaster awareness among constituents is promoting it to the school through different programs. This is usually facilitated by SDRRM. Another item also related to the campaign is the integration of DRRM in subject areas. Because of the encouragement of across learning, DRRM is one subject that can be attached to any lesson.

Available resources are an inventory process for schools to identify what they can have to provide. This is importantly needed in the aftermath of the event. Security and safety of school records and other equipment are necessary. Records are important documents and must be placed in an area where they cannot be reached by water or eaten by insects. Different drills for emergencies are done quarterly to practice individuals to evacuate and what actions to do during the emergency hour. Particularly under the storing of school records, documents, equipment, and learning materials in secured rooms or areas and the conduct of drills.

Accommodation for the community is anticipated here in the Philippines where schools serve as shelter. School, on the one hand, accepts the community to seek refuge. Educational continuity amidst circumstances is what the DepEd always mandated to ensure learning.

All items mentioned above are deemed very satisfactory for the teachers in five different schools. This implies that schools are showing resiliency and safe for all individuals, particularly learners. Given the school disaster safety, the factors to determine include the education curriculum, school commitment, school facilities and infrastructure, preparedness, empowerment of institutional roles, information disclosure, supervisory system, and the ability of school residents which allows increasing school resilience. It also described that schools under the North 1 District follow strictly what is mandated. School administrators, therefore, are ensuring the welfare of everybody and thus employ necessary steps to make their school perform with safety and readiness.

Ventura and Madrigal (2020) stated in their study that public schools instilled vital knowledge in preparation for coming disasters. This implies that schools follow the implementation of different safety preparations and conditions schools ready for any disaster. They revealed in their study that the Philippines is more responsive in facing disasters compare to Indonesia. They stressed that the deep understanding of the Filipinos to disaster is rooted in the experience in the community. Concerning the roles of teachers and administrators, it can be said that there is no difference at all.

A study presented to succeed in the DRRM relative to school performance is coordination. Poor coordination resulted in ineffective school-based disaster preparedness and transformational method (which implies the item in safety and readiness in this study). This is also exposed by Maglangit *et al.* (2019) in their study that poor in areas such as school-based reduction plan, risk reduction team, sustainability of DRR measures implementation, protocol on safety and school records are affecting the implementation which directly implies the performance of the school. Therefore, it is noted that compliance on what to consider in the attainment of safety and readiness is valuable and needed to revisit.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

Faustina *et al.* (2019) found in their study that signaling devices and DRR programs have given students and employees to be more aware of disasters. Readiness is being fostered. However, their study also revealed a contradictory finding. It said that more drills become bad because people do not take the drills seriously in the long run. After all, it is repetitive drills done in a year.

3.3. Significant Difference in the School Performance when Grouped According to Their Demographic Profile

It is revealed there is no significant difference in the perceived school performance when grouped to their age (F=1.196, p=0.317). This result entailed that the age of the teachers does not affect how they perceived the school performance in terms of safety and readiness. Younger teachers and older teachers have comparable evaluations of school performance in terms of safety and readiness. Thus, the null hypothesis of school performance when grouped to age was not rejected (see **Table 7**).

The result revealed that regardless of the age of the respondents, there is no difference when rating the school performance on safety and readiness. This result implies that ages from different brackets have the same understanding of how their schools implement the statements in the school performance.

Table 7. Differences in school performance according to their age.

Age (in years) Group	School Performance		F-value	p-value	Remarks
	Mean	SD			
20-29 (n=14)	3.80	0.51			
30-39 (n=33)	3.90	0.55	1.196	0.317	*Not significant*
40-49 (n=11)	3.77	0.71			
50-65 (n=23)	3.57	0.79			

Note: not significant at the 0.05 level (p-value >0.05)

Age has no significant relationship in identifying the readiness of the school (Panes *et al*., 2020). They found out that younger teachers were found familiar with disasters than older teachers. However, they were confused about the disaster adaptation process compared to the elder. As stipulated that there is a comparable evaluation of the teachers according to age which can be interpreted as no significant difference in terms of age (see **Table 8**).

Table 8. Differences in the school performance according to their sex.

Gender Group	School Performance		t-value	p-value	Remarks
	Mean	SD			
Male (n=20)	3.91	0.69			
Female (n=61)	3.72	0.63	1.147	0.255	*Not significant*

Note: not significant at the 0.05 level (p-value >0.05)

It is revealed in the table that there is no significant difference in the perceived school performance when grouped to their sex (t=1.147, p=0.255). This result implied that the sex of the teachers does not affect how they perceived the school performance in terms of safety and readiness. Male and female teachers have comparable evaluations of school performance in terms of safety and readiness. Thus, the null hypothesis of school performance when grouped to sex was not rejected.

It has been validated by the table above that between two sexes (male and female), there can be no difference in determining school performance. Males and females do think the same observation about their schools' performances.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

This study also claims that rating the statements under the school performance on safety and readiness would not directly affect the result. A notable remark is that despite the difference in number of the respondents, it can be predicted to say that the assumption of no difference would appear. However, this goes against Tuladhar *et al*. (2015) findings because they claimed that there is a significant difference between male and female teachers when it comes to disaster knowledge, disaster readiness, disaster awareness, and disaster perception.

In the study done by Ronquillo (2020), he revealed that there was no difference in terms of sex in the perceived level of preparedness relative to readiness except for capacity building. Most of his respondents were female over male.

In this study, it agrees that there is no difference in terms of sex in the readiness as deemed school performance, at the same time, it also disagrees on the part of capacity building because as it showed in Table 6 (items related to capacity building) the rate was very satisfactory and therefore opposes it. It is strongly believed by the researcher that when it comes to evaluation and the ability to investigate individuals towards their school performance, sex does not define who can be better in charge of the evaluation. Indeed, this argues that everyone is not influenced by their biological sexual orientation in giving their fair judgment and observation.

Table 9. Differences in the school performance according to their years of service.

Years of Service Group	School Performance		F-value	p-value	Remarks
	Mean	SD			
less than 1 (n=9)	3.77	0.42			
1-4 (n=12)	3.65	0.48			
5-9 (n=25)	4.03	0.53	1.115	0.362	*Not significant*
10-14 (n=6)	3.61	0.79			
15-19 (n=6)	3.79	0.82			
20-24 (n=8)	3.67	0.84			
25-34 (n=15)	3.55	0.78			

Note: not significant at the 0.05 level (p-value >0.05)

It shows that there is no significant difference in the perceived school performance when grouped to their years of service (F=1.115, p=0.362). This result entailed that the years of service of the teachers does not affect how they perceived the school performance in terms of safety and readiness. Novice teachers (less than 4 years) and experienced teachers (more than 10 years) have comparable evaluations of the school's performance in terms of safety and readiness. Thus, the null hypothesis of school performance when grouped into years of service was not rejected. This brings us to the idea that whether the teachers who are novices and teachers who have been called experienced do not differ in their observation of the schools' performances. The probable reason for relative judgment is the idea that statements under the school performance on safety and readiness do not account for the experience or length of service in the system but rather an open for all judgment. This study claims that regardless of years stayed in the service, the ability to assess the school's performance on safety and readiness would remain no different.

Zakar and Ashilan (2012), cited by Ismael *et al.*, more years of teaching implied different attitudes, good interactions, and high decision-making. There are more advantages to having more years in teaching as claimed by the studies of (Onyekuru & Ibegbunam, 2013; Aloka & Bojuwoye, 2013; Fatma & Tugay, 2015; cited in Ismael *et al.*). The implementation of school preparations is significantly dependent on the length of service (Manuel & Gelido, 2021). However, this study disagrees with the claim mentioned above as it is shown in this part that there is no difference between the teachers in terms of their years of service in the system.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

Sivasakthi and Muthumanickam (2012), as cited by Ismael *et al.,* supported the claim of this study. According to them, there is no difference between teachers who have many years in service the novice teachers. It does not determine their ability to do their roles. Additionally, the number of years does not guarantee to earn authority to give in-depth observation and analysis. Everyone can do it regardless of their stay in the teaching profession.

Table 10. Differences in the school performance according to their field of specialization.

Field of Specialization Group	School Performance		F-value	p-value	Remarks
	Mean	SD			
English (n=11)	3.93	0.58			
Filipino (n=10)	3.88	1.08			
Mathematics (n=10)	3.51	0.68			
Science (n=15)	3.49	0.40	1.393	0.229	*Not significant*
Araling Panlipunan (n=11)	4.00	0.41			
TLE (n=15)	3.93	0.55			
Others (n=9)	3.67	0.68			

Note: not significant at the 0.05 level (p-value >0.05) Others include MAPEH, Values Education

This revealed that there is no significant difference in the perceived school performance when grouped to their field of specialization (F=1.393, p=0.229). This result detailed that the field of specialization of the teachers does not influence how they perceived the school performance in terms of safety and readiness. English major teachers or Science major teachers have almost negligible differences in their evaluation of the school performance in terms of safety and readiness. Thus, the null hypothesis of school performance when grouped into the field of specialization was not rejected.

Different field of specialization in high school is presented in **Table 10** but one sure result it tells: there is no difference when grouped to this profile. In simple terms, teachers who belonged to different fields do not seem to imply the difference. It can be claimed here that there is no favorable learning area that school performance on safety and readiness is dominant which caused a difference. Teachers who teach DRRM concepts relative to safety and readiness are not separated in how they rate their schools. Further, even in subjects integrated with DRRM, teachers who teach it do not differ in their opinion on this rating matter. Integrating local and indigenous knowledge (LINK) refers to DRRM imbued in science, social studies, and arts do not prevail to effectuate the result above. This is also what Canlas (2019) found in his study review on four countries that Philippines integrated DRRM in science which allows people to assume there is an advantage for science teachers when it comes to details in DRRM-related topics particularly on safety and readiness of school. However, Canlas (2019) did not assume in his study the effect of integrating DRR in other fields and admitted that there was no exploration yet in this study. UNESCO (2014) reminds us that DRR is not only incorporated in science but in every subject can be. It requires creativity for teachers to include DRRM topics.

Table 11. Differences in the school performance according to their level of DRRM training.

Level of DRRM Training Group	School Performance		F-value	p-value	Remarks
	Mean	SD			
None (n=48)	3.65[a]	0.66			
The school (n=20)	3.79[a]	0.51	3.808*	0.026	*Significant*
Others (n=13)	4.19[b]	0.64			

*Note: *-significant at the 0.05 level Others include division, district, national and international*
ab-based on the Duncan test for posthoc comparison (the same letter means no statistical difference)

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

It can be gleaned that there is a significant difference in the perceived school performance when grouped to their level of DRRM training (F=3.808, p=0.026). This result depicted that the level of DRRM training of the teachers does influence how they perceived the school performance in terms of safety and readiness. The teachers who have division or district training (M=4.19, SD=0.64) have a higher perceived evaluation of the school performance in terms of safety and readiness as compared to those who have no DRRM training (M=3.65, SD=0.66). Thus, the null hypothesis of school performance when grouped to the level of DRRM training was not rejected.

Subject to training exposure of the teachers, there is a clear point that the table denotes. Teachers with no DRRM training have seen a difference in view from the teachers who attended DRRM training. Training capacitate teachers to have logical knowledge, attitude, and deep values aside from earning skills. It makes trainees aware of the details of DRRM which is implicitly depicted in the result. It is said that teachers who have high-level training exposure such as division-wide, national, and even international have shown critical evaluation of the school performance. They are particular about the safety and readiness guidelines and measures. Therefore, they do think their rate by reviewing in their minds what they have learned appropriate for a certain concept example the location of some equipment, maps, plans, and the like.

Regis (2020) revealed the significant difference in the number of training the individual has for the implementation of the measures for safety and readiness. The high level of the school's performance when it comes to implementation is due to the training exposed to. Therefore, the schools should heighten the conduct of training that is congruent to the DepEd issuances. With the promotion of readiness of school, adaptation strategies can be done which include training inside and outside the classroom that provides teachers and the school to do drills.

This signifies that having training can help someone understand the indicators under readiness and safety which can come to a point that there is a significant difference between teachers who have the training and who do not in perceiving the school performance.

The Department of Education should organize a developmental program on disasters reduction and reinforced by Olaivar and Povar (2017) that the schools need to continue and further expand the training to benefits everyone.

UNESCO (2014) mentioned four steps for teachers to become a role-model and risk-smart champion and these are to know the basics of DRR, facilitate the learning of DRRM, make a school a safe space, and extend help to students after a disaster. This can be done with the implementation of training for teachers. As Cañete (2019) stressed that there is a correlation between low professional development, low professional competence, and less professional engagement in DRRM training. Therefore, competence and development are determined by how much training is exposed to someone.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings support the efficacy of the orders of the Department of Education. However, the scope of the study being explored is in one certain area. The different factors affecting school performance in terms of safety and readiness can be tested at any other geographical location in the country to ensure a more conclusive result. It is also given that the study on school performance as referred to safety and readiness is not explored because it is always perceived as totally similar to the compliance and implementation in DRRM. Though both are intersecting school performance as referred to here is more specific based on the

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815

concordance of guidelines in the preparation of school which safety and readiness is the primary concern.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher acknowledges the contribution of the respondents and the school heads who positively allow this study to be conducted in their school. The Department of Science and Technology (DOST) granted a decent amount for the whole paper which this article is a part. Lastly, the professors who contributed to shaping the paper and relevant to this day in educational administration.

6. AUTHORS' NOTE

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. The paper is original and had checked with the plagiarism test and panel deliberation.

7. REFERENCES

Abejuela, H., Ejem, L., and del Rosario, A. (2020). Disaster risk reduction and management mechanisms for school-aged children in flood and landslide vulnerable areas in the province of bukidnon. *Asia Pacific Journal of Social and Behavioral Sciences, 18,* 43-60.

Acaylar, E. and Reyes, R. (2021). Governance and challenges among schools in division of zamboanga del norte amidst Covid 19. *International Journal of Research Engineering, Science and Management, 4* (11), 37-44.

Bacus, J. (2020). Disaster risk reduction management in carcar central elementary school Cebu City. *Central Mindanao University Journal of Science, 1,* 19-25.

Cabilao-Valencia, M., Ali, M., Maryani, E. and Supriatna, N. (2018). Integration of disaster risk reduction in the curriculum of philippine educational institution. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 253,* 463-468.

Cañete, S. (2019). Regression model for the professional engagement among high school teachers in disaster risk reduction management. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research, 48*(2), 144-150.

Canlas, I. (2019). A review of disaster risk reduction education in Japan, the Philippines Indonesia and Fiji Islands. *Innovative Technology and Management Journal, 2,* 47-60.

Ismael, R., Arshad, R., and Abas, Z. (2018). Can teachers' age and experience influence teacher effectiveness in HOTS?. *International Journal of Advanced Studies in Social Sciences and Innovation, 2*(1), 144-158.

Maglangit, M., Pagobo, A., Adem, A., Gagani, R., and Montalban, R. (2019). Disaster and risk reduction preparedness evaluation of the 6th district schools of Lapu-Lapu City. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research, 3*(5), 203-206.

Manuel, S. K. J. and Gelido, R.T. (2021). Disaster risk reduction management plan of secondary schools in Sta. Barbara, Philippines. *ASEAN Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 9*(1), 16-40.

Mirzaei, S., Tafti, A., Mohammadinia, L., Nasiriani, K., Rahaei, Z., Falahzadeh, H., and Amiri, H. (2020). Operational strategies for establishing disaster-resilient schools: A qualitative study. *Advanced Journal of Emergency Medicine, 4*(2), 23.

Olaivar, N. and Pobar, R. (2017). Brigada eskwela and disaster preparedness as an approach to pupil's academic achievement. *International Journal of Environmental and Rural Development, 8*(2), 82-87.

Olaivar, N. and Pobar, R. (2017). Brigada eskwela and disaster preparedness as an approach to pupil's academic achievement. *International Journal of Environmental and Rural Development, 8*(2), 82-87.

Panes, R., Panes, I., Ventayen, R., Pereyras, J., and Ventayen, C. (2020). Disaster preparedness and readiness of an institution in one ASEAN Country. *A-MRJ, 4*(1), 34-48.

Regis, D. (2020). Implementation of the school disaster risk reduction management in public elementary schools in region VIII. *Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 2*(1), 48-61.

Ronquillo, R. (2020). Teachers' preparedness on disaster risk reduction and management measures among public senior high schools in the division of Batangas City. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology, 5*(12), 306-313.

Santos, G. (2021). 2020 tropical cyclones in the Philippines: A review. *Tropical Cyclone Research and Review, 10*(3), 191-199.

Ventura, G. and Madrigal, D. (2020). Awareness and practices on disaster preparedness of students of a public high school in antique. *Philippine Social Science Journal, 3*(2), 45-46.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/xxxx.xxxx
p- ISSN 2775-6793 e- ISSN 2775-6815