

Teachers' Management on the Student Awareness and Preparedness in the Implementation of Risk Reduction

Jaynn April Toque Amante

Laguna State Polytechnic University Sta. Cruz Laguna 4009 PHILIPPINES

Email address: toquejaynnapril@gmail.com

Abstract—This study centers on the Teachers' Management on the Student Awareness and Preparedness in the Implementation of Risk Reduction in selected schools in the fourth district of Laguna. The main purpose of this study is to determine the level of teachers' management on the student awareness and preparedness in implementing risk reduction. Furthermore, this study also determines the significant relationship between teachers' management on the student awareness and preparedness in implementing risk reduction. This research used a descriptive method of research to gather the necessary information and data. The respondents were 222 teachers from selected public schools in the fourth district of Laguna. School year 2025-2026. A self-made survey questionnaire was used in this study. Findings showed that the level of teachers' management in student awareness in risk reduction appears to be highly evident among the respondents, and appears to have a remark that strongly agree with the verbal interpretation of very high. Furthermore, the level of student preparedness in risk reduction appears to be evident among the respondents, and appears to have a remark of agree with the verbal interpretation of high. Thus, students' overall readiness can be strengthened by improving these elements through ongoing practice, interactive instruction, and reinforcement of practical abilities. There is a significant relationship between teachers' management in student awareness and preparedness in risk reduction. Teachers' management shows significant relationship on student awareness and preparedness in risk reduction. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it is concluded that teachers' management in student awareness and preparedness underscores the importance of implementing educational strategies in keeping schools safe and ready for disasters, and also, having a good understanding in DRR concepts, a positive attitude toward safety practices and know how to act during drills and emergencies. Based on the drawn conclusions resulted to the following recommendations: The researcher recommends that the school heads may have regular and thorough training programs, workshops, and seminars that teach students how to prepare for disasters, identify risks, and respond to emergencies, also, school heads may do drills and simulations more often and in a more realistic way to help both teachers and students get better at responding, and school heads may regularly check and rate how well DRR programs and activities are working to find the problems and to make sure that they are always getting better; Lastly, further studies about disaster risk reduction and management are encouraged among future researchers in order to improve and broaden disaster management knowledge and skills, also, future researchers may think additional variables for their study to enhance their readings of corresponding work, which could support the current research initiative's conclusions even more.

Keywords— Teachers' Management, Student Awareness, Student Preparedness, Risk Reduction.

I. INTRODUCTION

Resilience in disaster management was essential for students as it enabled them to recover from crises. However, many countries struggled to foster this skill due to gaps in disaster education, psychological support, and preparedness programs (Surjan & Shaw, 2020). Disaster risk reduction is really important for keeping schools safe and helping everyone bounce back from tough situations. Schools have to look out for students all the time, especially when emergencies hit, and teachers are right in the middle of that. They guide things like how to understand risks and actually put safety stuff into practice.

Teachers handle a lot through planning lessons, watching over activities, and coordinating with others on safety. This stuff directly shapes how students think about hazards and get ready to handle them. It is not just about handing out facts, though. Students pick up awareness and skills from ongoing guidance and hands-on training that educators lead.

When teachers do drills or safety talks well or weave disaster info into regular classes, kids end up knowing more, feeling confident, and acting right in crises. Looking at how teachers manage this can show ways to build better readiness in schools and create a real safety mindset.

The point of this study is to dig into teachers' management and its effect on student awareness and preparedness for risk reduction. It highlights why strong leadership from educators matters in making school communities more resilient. Not everything is straightforward here; it seems like there are gaps in how it's done sometimes.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Problem/s which were addressed by the research

This study centers on the Teachers' Management on the Student Awareness and Preparedness in the Implementation of Risk Reduction in selected junior high schools in the fourth district of Laguna.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following problems:

1. What is the level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of:
 - 1.1 Preparedness Planning;
 - 1.2 Risk Identification;
 - 1.3 Response Management;
 - 1.4 Capacity Building; and

- 1.5 Recovery Participation?
- 2. What is the level of students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of:
 - 2.1 Knowledge and Understanding;
 - 2.2 Information Exposure;
 - 2.3 Perception and Attitude;
 - 2.4 Behavioral Response; and
 - 2.5 Application Knowledge?
- 3. What is the level of students' preparedness in risk reduction in terms of:
 - 3.1 Knowledge and Safety Procedures;
 - 3.2 Participation in Drills and Training;
 - 3.3 Emergency Readiness;
 - 3.4 Response Skills; and
 - 3.5 Risk Awareness and Prevention?
- 4. Does the teachers' management significantly correlate to the students' awareness in risk reduction?
- 5. Does the teachers' management significantly correlate to the students' preparedness in risk reduction?

II. METHODOLOGY

This research used a descriptive method of research to gather the necessary information and data. The respondents were 222 teachers from selected public schools in the fourth district of Laguna. School year 2025-2026. A self-made survey questionnaire was used in this study.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part presented the different results and discussed the results from treating the data gathered in this study. All specific questions in Chapter 1 under the statement of the problem were answered in this chapter supported by tables. It presents the data gathered about the significant correlation between the teachers' management to the students' awareness, preparedness in risk reduction. In particular, the study sought to address the following:

Level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction

In this study, the level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction refers to Preparedness Planning, Risk Identification, Response Management, Capacity Building, and Recovery Participation.

The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 1 shows the level of Teachers' Management in Preparedness Planning. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

The level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Preparedness Planning attained a weighted mean score of 4.69 and a standard deviation of 0.37 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents.

Effective teacher management improves school disaster readiness. The (M = 4.81) suggests a very high level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Preparedness Planning and supported with (SD = 0.44). Also, preparedness planning reduces risks during disasters. While the mean is slightly lower (M = 4.69) with (SD = 0.58), it still

indicates the continuous improvement in preparedness planning is necessary.

Table 1. Level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Preparedness Planning

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Teachers play a vital role in disaster preparedness planning	4.73	0.47	Strongly Agree
Effective teacher management improves school disaster readiness	4.81	0.44	Strongly Agree
Preparedness planning reduces risks during disasters	4.80	0.40	Strongly Agree
I feel prepared to manage my students during emergencies	4.41	0.70	Strongly Agree
Continuous improvement in preparedness planning is necessary	4.69	0.58	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.69		
SD	0.37		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

In summary, effective teacher management plays a crucial role in enhancing school disaster readiness, particularly in terms of preparedness planning. It indicates that teachers exhibit a strong level of management in risk reduction, reflecting their active involvement and competence in implementing preparedness strategies, suggesting that preparedness planning significantly contributes to minimizing risks during disasters, although it also implies the need for continuous improvement. Moreover, while teachers demonstrate a commendable level of preparedness planning, sustained efforts and enhancements are essential to maintain and further strengthen disaster risk reduction practices in schools.

Table 2. Level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Risk Identification

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Understand the concept of risk identification in disaster risk reduction	4.59	0.59	Strongly Agree
Familiar with common hazards that may affect your school	4.61	0.59	Strongly Agree
Identify potential risks in your classroom environment	4.62	0.58	Strongly Agree
Regularly checking the classroom for potential hazards.	4.51	0.54	Strongly Agree
You have received training on risk identification and hazard assessment	3.74	1.20	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.41		
SD	0.52		
Verbal Interpretation			Very High

Table 2 shows the level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Identify potential risks in your classroom environment. The (M = 4.62) suggests a very high level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Risk Reduction and supported with (SD = 0.58). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.74) with (SD = 1.20), it still indicates that receiving training on risk identification and hazard assessment is necessary.

The level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Risk Reduction attained a weighted mean score of

4.41 and a standard deviation of 0.52 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents.

In summary, this suggests that teachers are highly capable of recognizing hazards in their immediate environment. However, the lower mean score for receiving training on risk identification and hazard assessment, highlights a need for more consistent and enhanced training opportunities.

Table 3. Level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Response Management

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
You believe teachers play a crucial role in emergency response management	4.84	0.39	Strongly Agree
Effective response management reduces injuries and damage during disasters	4.90	0.30	Strongly Agree
Teachers' actions significantly affect student safety during emergencies.	4.86	0.34	Strongly Agree
You feel confident in managing students during disaster response	4.32	0.71	Strongly Agree
Continuous improvement in response management is necessary	4.69	0.57	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.72		
SD	0.29		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 3 shows the level of Teachers' Management in Response Management. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Effective response management reduces injuries and damage during disasters. The (M = 4.90) suggests a very high level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Response Management and supported with (SD = 0.30). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 4.32) with (SD = 0.71), it still indicates that teachers are really not confident in managing students during disaster response.

The level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Response Management attained a weighted mean score of 4.72 and a standard deviation of 0.29 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents.

In summary, this suggests that effective response management is strongly associated with reducing injuries and damage during disasters. It also shows that more capacity-building programs are needed to boost people's confidence and readiness. However, the lower mean score implies that some teachers may still experience uncertainty or lack full confidence in managing students during disaster response situations.

Table 4. Level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Capacity Building

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
You believe capacity building is essential in disaster risk reduction	4.73	0.46	Strongly Agree
Teachers' capacity directly affects the school's disaster preparedness level	4.74	0.46	Strongly Agree
Effective capacity building improves teachers' confidence during disasters.	4.77	0.42	Strongly Agree
You feel capable of contributing to disaster preparedness and response.	4.51	0.67	Strongly Agree
Continuous capacity building is necessary for effective disaster risk reduction.	4.68	0.57	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.69		
SD	0.41		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Table 4 shows the level of Teachers' Management in Capacity Building. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Effective capacity building improves teachers' confidence during disasters. The (M = 4.77) suggests a very high level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Capacity Building and supported with (SD = 0.42). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 4.68) with (SD = 0.57), it still indicates that continuous capacity building is necessary for effective disaster risk reduction.

The level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Capacity Building attained a weighted mean score of 4.69 and a standard deviation of 0.41 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents.

In summary, teachers demonstrate a very high level of management in risk reduction in terms of capacity building. This suggests that capacity building significantly enhances teachers' confidence during disasters. Overall, the findings emphasize that sustained training and development are essential to maintain and further strengthen teachers' effectiveness in disaster risk reduction.

Table 5 shows the level of Teachers' Management in Recovery Participation. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Table 5. Level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Recovery Participation

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
You believe teachers play a vital role in post-disaster recovery.	4.68	0.55	Strongly Agree
Teacher involvement speeds up the school's recovery process.	4.71	0.48	Strongly Agree
Effective recovery participation helps restore a safe learning environment.	4.71	0.48	Strongly Agree
You feel capable of participating in post-disaster recovery efforts.	4.55	0.61	Strongly Agree
Continuous improvement in recovery participation is necessary.	4.73	0.45	Strongly Agree
Weighted Mean	4.67		
SD	0.41		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Continuous improvement in recovery participation is necessary. The (M = 4.73) suggests a very high level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Recovery Participation and supported with (SD = 0.45). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 4.55) with (SD = 0.61), it still indicates that teachers' feel capable of participating in post-disaster recovery efforts.

The level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Recovery Participation attained a weighted mean score of 4.67 and a standard deviation of 0.41 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents.

In summary, the findings show that teachers exhibit a very high level of management in risk reduction in terms of recovery participation. This suggests that teachers actively engage in and recognize the importance of participating in post-disaster recovery efforts, it still indicates that teachers generally feel capable of contributing to recovery activities after disasters. Overall, the results emphasize that while recovery participation is strong among teachers, continuous

improvement is still necessary to further enhance their effectiveness and involvement in post-disaster initiatives.

Table 6 shows the Composite of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction. Also displays the indicators, weighted mean, standard deviation and verbal interpretation.

Table 6. Composite of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Preparedness Planning	4.69	0.37	Very High
Risk Identification	4.41	0.52	Very High
Response Management	4.72	0.29	Very High
Capacity Building	4.69	0.41	Very High
Recovery Participation	4.67	0.41	Very High
Grand Mean	4.64		
SD	0.40		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

The level of Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction in terms of Preparedness Planning, Risk Identification, Response Management, Capacity Building, and Recovery Participation, arrived at a grand mean score of 4.64 and a standard deviation of 0.40 and was verbally interpreted as very high among the respondents. This means that the Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction recognize their crucial role in disaster, emphasizing effective planning leadership, and organizational skills to mitigate risks and enhance school readiness. Nonetheless, differences in personal confidence and access to training suggest a need for more uniform and comprehensive capacity-building initiatives. In general, enhancing teachers' skills through ongoing training and support is crucial for developing resilient, well-prepared, and safe school environments.

Level of students' awareness in risk reduction

In this study, the level of students' awareness in risk reduction refers to Knowledge and Understanding, Information Exposure, Perception and Attitude, Behavioral Response, and Application Knowledge.

The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 7. Level of students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of Knowledge and Understanding

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students can explain appropriate actions before, during, and after disasters.	3.83	0.76	Agree
Students can distinguish between hazard, risk, and disaster.	3.82	0.74	Agree
Students understand the importance of cooperation and discipline during emergencies.	3.84	0.75	Agree
Students are aware of the risks associated with their school and community location.	3.91	0.77	Agree
Students are aware of school disaster preparedness plans and procedures.	3.92	0.73	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.86		
SD	0.67		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 7 shows the level of Students' Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Understanding. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Students are aware of school disaster preparedness plans and procedures. The (M = 3.92) suggests a very high level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Understanding and supported with (SD = 0.73). Also, students are aware of the risks associated with their school and community location. While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.82) with (SD = 0.74), it still indicates that students can't distinguish between hazard, risk, and disaster.

The level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Understanding attained a weighted mean score of 3.86 and a standard deviation of 0.67 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

To conclude, the findings show that although students have a solid grasp of preparedness methods and disaster concepts, additional stress on both practical skills and conceptual knowledge is required to guarantee complete emergency preparedness. However, the results also suggest a gap in conceptual understanding, particularly in distinguishing between hazard, risk, and disaster. Overall, while student awareness is generally high, there remains a need to strengthen their conceptual clarity to improve their understanding of disaster risk reduction concepts.

Table 8 shows the level of Students' Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Information Exposure. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Table 8. Level of students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of Information Exposure

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Risk reduction concepts are integrated into the subjects taught to students.	4.08	0.72	Agree
Students receive information on disaster preparedness through school activities (e.g., drills, orientations)	4.27	0.60	Strongly Agree
Students are exposed to visual materials (posters, charts, bulletin boards) related to risk reduction in school.	4.21	0.60	Strongly Agree
Information on risk reduction is reinforced through repeated school activities and lessons.	4.06	0.66	Agree
Students share or discuss disaster-related information learned from outside the school.	4.01	0.77	Agree
Weighted Mean	4.13		
SD	0.57		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Students receive information on disaster preparedness through school activities (e.g., drills, orientations). The (M = 4.27) suggests a very high level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Information Exposure and supported with (SD = 0.60). Also, students are exposed to visual materials (posters, charts, bulletin boards) related to risk reduction in school. While the mean is slightly lower (M = 4.01) with (SD = 0.77), it still indicates that students didn't share or discuss disaster related information learned from outside the school.

The level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Information Exposure attained a weighted mean score of 4.13 and a standard deviation of 0.57 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, the results indicate that the school actively raises awareness of disaster risk reduction through a variety of

tactics, however there is still need to improve consistency and increase engagement to guarantee that every student completely understands and applies these lessons.

Table 9. Level of students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of Perception and Attitude

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students take initiative in participating in school safety programs or activities.	3.86	0.72	Agree
Students are aware of the consequences of ignoring safety rules during disasters.	3.81	0.78	Agree
Students are motivated to learn more about disaster risk reduction when exposed to relevant information.	3.86	0.74	Agree
Students value the importance of school disaster preparedness plans and policies.	3.84	0.79	Agree
Students show positive attitudes toward collaboration with teachers and peers in implementing safety measures.	3.86	0.69	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.84		
SD	0.63		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 9 shows the level of Students' Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Perception and Attitude. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Students take initiative in participating in school safety programs or activities. The (M = 3.86) suggests a very high level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Perception and Attitude and supported with (SD = 0.72). Also, students are motivated to learn more about disaster risk reduction when exposed to relevant information with (SD = 0.74) and lastly, students show positive attitudes toward collaboration with teachers and peers in implementing safety measures with (SD = 0.69). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.81) with (SD = 0.78), it still indicates that students are not aware of the consequences of ignoring safety rules during disasters.

The level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Perception and Attitude attained a weighted mean score of 3.84 and a standard deviation of 0.63 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, this suggests that students actively take initiative in participating in school safety programs and demonstrate positive attitudes toward disaster risk reduction. They are also motivated to learn more when exposed to relevant information and show willingness to collaborate with teachers and peers in implementing safety measures. However, it also indicates that some students may lack full awareness of the consequences of ignoring safety rules during disasters. Overall, while students exhibit positive perceptions and attitudes, there is still a need to further strengthen their understanding of the importance and implications of safety compliance.

Table 10 shows the level of Students' Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Behavioral Response. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Students cooperate with teachers and school personnel during preparedness activities. The (M = 4.05) suggests a very high level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Behavioral Response and supported with (SD = 0.67). While

the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.87) with (SD = 0.66), it still indicates that students didn't demonstrate correct responses during unexpected emergency situations.

Table 10. Level of students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of Behavioral Response

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students follow instructions during safety drills and emergency simulations.	3.99	0.65	Agree
Students cooperate with teachers and school personnel during preparedness activities.	4.05	0.67	Agree
Students demonstrate safe behavior during potentially hazardous situations.	3.88	0.67	Agree
Students show responsibility in maintaining classroom safety.	3.89	0.63	Agree
Students demonstrate correct responses during unexpected emergency situations.	3.87	0.66	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.94		
SD	0.58		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Behavioral Response attained a weighted mean score of 3.94 and a standard deviation of 0.58 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, this suggests that students generally cooperate with teachers and school personnel during preparedness activities. However, the slightly lower mean score indicates that some students do not consistently demonstrate correct responses during unexpected emergency situations. Overall, while students show positive cooperative behavior, there is still a need to enhance their practical response skills to ensure appropriate actions during actual emergencies.

Table 11 shows the level of Students' Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Application Knowledge. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Table 11. Level of students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of Application Knowledge

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students apply disaster preparedness knowledge during drills and simulations.	3.93	0.79	Agree
Students apply learned safety practices when faced with risky situations or emergencies.	3.92	0.80	Agree
Students demonstrate proper use of safety equipment and emergency materials.	3.83	0.75	Agree
Students apply safety habits that help prevent accidents in school.	3.85	0.80	Agree
Students use critical thinking in solving problems related to safety and disaster preparedness.	3.77	0.80	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.86		
SD	0.73		
Verbal Interpretation	Very High		

Students apply disaster preparedness knowledge during drills and simulations. The (M = 3.93) suggests a very high level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Application Knowledge and supported with (SD = 0.79). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.77) with (SD = 0.80), it still indicates that some students didn't use their critical thinking in solving problems related to safety disaster preparedness.

The level of Student Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Application Knowledge attained a weighted mean score of

3.86 and a standard deviation of 0.73 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, the results show that students can use their safety knowledge in real-life situations, but there is still room for improvement, especially when it comes to improving their ability to think critically in emergencies.

Table 12 shows the composite of students' awareness in risk reduction. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Table 12. Composite of students' awareness in risk reduction

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Knowledge and Understanding	3.86	0.67	High
Information Exposure	4.13	0.57	High
Perception and Attitude	3.84	0.63	High
Behavioral Response	3.94	0.58	High
Application Knowledge	3.86	0.73	High
Grand Mean	3.93		
SD	0.65		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The level of Students' Awareness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Understanding, Information Exposure, Perception and Attitude, Behavioral Response and Application Knowledge, arrived at a grand mean score of 3.93 and a standard deviation of 0.65 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents. This suggests that schools are successful in incorporating disaster awareness into lessons and activities, allowing pupils to acquire both conceptual knowledge and emergency-appropriate actions.

Even though students are well-prepared, there is still a need to improve their critical thinking skills and guarantee ongoing participation in disaster-related education. Students will be more equipped to react appropriately and successfully in real-world scenarios if these elements are strengthened. In general, maintaining and enhancing disaster education initiatives is crucial to developing a student body that is more resilient and safety-conscious

Level of students' preparedness in risk reduction

In this study, the level of students' preparedness in risk reduction refers to Knowledge and Safety Procedures, Participation in Drills and Training, Emergency Readiness, Response Skills, and Risk Awareness and Prevention.

The following tables show the statement, mean, standard deviation, remarks and verbal interpretation from the perspectives of respondents.

Table 13 shows the level of Students' Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Safety Procedures. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks. Students know evacuation routes and designated safe areas. The (M = 3.96) suggests a very high level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Safety Procedures and supported with (SD = 0.77). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.84) with (SD = 0.80), it still indicates that students didn't really show understanding of basic emergency response practices such as first aid and reporting emergencies.

Table 13. Level of students' preparedness in risk reduction in terms of Knowledge and Safety Procedures

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students understand the importance of disaster preparedness and prevention.	3.90	0.81	Agree
Students show understanding of basic emergency response practices such as first aid and reporting emergencies.	3.84	0.80	Agree
Students remain calm and cooperative during emergency drills.	3.86	0.82	Agree
Students know evacuation routes and designated safe areas.	3.96	0.77	Agree
Students listen carefully and follow instructions given by teachers or school authorities during emergencies.	3.94	0.81	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.90		
SD	0.71		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Safety Procedures attained a weighted mean score of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.71 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, the results suggests that students are generally knowledgeable about evacuation routes and designated safe areas. However, the slightly lower mean score indicates that students have limited understanding of basic emergency response practices, such as first aid and proper reporting of emergencies. Overall, while students demonstrate strong awareness of safety procedures, there is a need to further enhance their practical knowledge and skills in emergency response.

Table 14 shows the level of Students' Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Participation in Drills and Training. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Table 14. Level of students' preparedness in risk reduction in terms of Participation in Drills and Training

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students show seriousness and focus during drills and training activities.	3.68	0.93	Agree
Students willingly join disaster preparedness trainings conducted by the school.	3.92	0.69	Agree
Students ask questions or seek clarification during disaster preparedness training sessions.	3.68	0.95	Agree
Students show confidence in performing emergency procedures learned from trainings.	3.78	0.89	Agree
Students recognize the importance of participating in disaster preparedness activities.	3.84	0.92	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.77		
SD	0.80		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Students willingly join disaster preparedness trainings conducted by the school. The (M = 3.92) suggests a very high level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Participation in Drills and Training and supported with (SD = 0.69). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.68) with (SD = 0.93), it still indicates that some students didn't really show seriousness and focus during drills and training activities, also, some students didn't ask questions or seek clarification during preparedness training sessions.

The level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Participation in Drills and Training attained a weighted mean score of 3.77 and a standard deviation of 0.80 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents. In summary, the results suggests that students are generally willing to join disaster preparedness activities conducted by the school. However, the slightly lower mean score indicates that some students do not consistently demonstrate seriousness and focus during these activities, and may not actively engage by asking questions or seeking clarification. Overall, while participation is high, there is a need to enhance students' engagement and attentiveness to maximize the effectiveness of disaster preparedness training.

Table 15 shows the level of Students' Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Emergency Readiness. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Students are aware of the school's emergency response and evacuation plans, also students know the location of emergency exits, safe areas, and assembly points. The (M = 3.93) suggests a very high level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Emergency Readiness and supported with (SD = 0.76). Lastly, students recognize the importance of being prepared for emergencies both at school and at home. While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.81) with (SD = 0.70), it still indicates that some students can't assist classmates safely during drills or emergencies.

Table 15. Level of students' preparedness in risk reduction in terms of Emergency Readiness

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students are aware of the school's emergency response and evacuation plans.	3.93	0.76	Agree
Students know the location of emergency exits, safe areas, and assembly points.	3.93	0.76	Agree
Students remain calm and composed during drills or actual emergencies.	3.85	0.72	Agree
Students can assist classmates safely during drills or emergencies.	3.81	0.70	Agree
Students recognize the importance of being prepared for emergencies both at school and at home.	3.93	0.76	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.89		
SD	0.67		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

The level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Emergency Readiness attained a weighted mean score of 3.89 and a standard deviation of 0.67 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, the results suggests that students are generally aware of the school's emergency response and evacuation plans, including the locations of exits, safe areas, and assembly points. They also recognize the importance of being prepared for emergencies both in school and at home. However, the slightly lower mean score indicates that some students may lack the ability to safely assist their classmates during drills or actual emergencies. Overall, while students demonstrate strong awareness and readiness, there is a need to further develop their practical skills in assisting others during emergency situations.

Table 16. Level of students' preparedness in risk reduction in terms of Response Skills

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students remain calm and composed during drills or actual emergencies.	3.73	0.82	Agree
Students follow emergency procedures without needing repeated instructions.	3.73	0.82	Agree
Students demonstrate correct use of emergency equipment (e.g., fire extinguishers, alarms) during drills.	3.79	0.74	Agree
Students show awareness of personal safety while assisting others during emergencies.	3.78	0.66	Agree
Students show confidence in performing emergency response actions independently.	3.80	0.68	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.77		
SD	0.66		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 16 shows the level of Students' Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Response Skills. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

Students show confidence in performing emergency response actions independently. The (M = 3.80) suggests a very high level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Response Skills and supported with (SD = 0.68). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.73) with (SD = 0.82), it still indicates that some students can't remain calm and composed during drills or actual emergencies. Also, some students didn't follow emergency procedures without needing repeated instructions.

The level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Response Skills attained a weighted mean score of 3.77 and a standard deviation of 0.66 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

In summary, the result shows that students generally show confidence in performing emergency response actions independently. However, the slightly lower mean score indicates that some students may struggle to remain calm and composed during drills or actual emergency situations. It also suggests that not all students consistently follow emergency procedures without the need for repeated instructions. Overall, while students demonstrate a strong level of preparedness in response skills, there is still a need to further strengthen their composure, independence, and adherence to emergency protocols during critical situations.

Table 17 shows the level of Students' Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Risk Awareness and Prevention. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks. Students encourage peers to follow safety rules and prevent risky behaviors. The (M = 3.91) suggests a very high level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Risk Awareness and Prevention and supported with (SD = 0.72). While the mean is slightly lower (M = 3.76) with (SD = 0.76), it still indicates that some students didn't practice preventive measures, such as keeping their surroundings safe and clean.

The level of Student Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Risk Awareness and Prevention attained a weighted mean score of 3.85 and a standard deviation of 0.65 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents.

Table 17. Level of students' preparedness in risk reduction in terms of Risk Awareness and Prevention

Statements	Mean	SD	Remarks
Students recognize behaviors that may pose risks to themselves or others	3.86	0.69	Agree
Students practice preventive measures, such as keeping their surroundings safe and clean.	3.76	0.76	Agree
Students are aware of natural and human-made hazards in their community.	3.89	0.69	Agree
Students report unsafe conditions or hazards to teachers or school authorities.	3.84	0.74	Agree
Students encourage peers to follow safety rules and prevent risky behaviors.	3.91	0.72	Agree
Weighted Mean	3.85		
SD	0.65		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

In summary, the results suggests that students generally encourage their peers to follow safety rules and avoid risky behaviors. However, the slightly lower mean score indicates that some students do not consistently practice preventive measures, such as maintaining clean and safe surroundings. Overall, while students demonstrate strong awareness and positive influence on others regarding safety, there is still a need to reinforce consistent application of preventive practices in their daily environment.

Table 18. Composite of students' preparedness in risk reduction

Indicators	Weighted Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
Knowledge and Safety Procedures	3.90	0.71	High
Participation in Drills and Training	3.77	0.80	High
Emergency Readiness	3.89	0.67	High
Response Skills	3.77	0.66	High
Risk Awareness and Prevention	3.85	0.65	High
Grand Mean	3.84		
SD	0.70		
Verbal Interpretation	High		

Table 18 shows the composite of students' preparedness in risk reduction. Also displays the statements, mean, standard deviation and remarks.

The level of Students' Preparedness in Risk Reduction in terms of Knowledge and Safety Procedures, Participation in Drills and Training, Emergency Readiness, Response Skills, and Risk Awareness and Prevention, arrived at a grand mean score of 3.84 and a standard deviation of 0.70 and was verbally interpreted as high among the respondents. The findings imply that students are able to follow directions, understand emergency procedures, and are conscious of safety precautions in the classroom. A good attitude toward disaster preparedness is further demonstrated by their willingness to take part in drills and their understanding of the significance of readiness. Despite these advantages, there is still need for growth in a few areas, including critical response abilities, active participation during training, and peer support during emergencies. Students' overall readiness can be strengthened by improving these elements through ongoing practice, interactive instruction, and reinforcement of practical abilities.

Test of correlation between the teachers' management to the students' awareness in risk reduction

To test the significant correlation between the teachers' management to the students' awareness in risk reduction in terms of Knowledge and Understanding, Information Exposure, Perception and Attitude, Behavioral Response, and Application Knowledge they were treated statistically using Real Statistics Data Analysis Tools using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Table 19 shows the significant correlation between the teachers' management to the students' awareness in risk reduction. Significant Positive Correlation A significant positive correlation was observed between the Preparedness Planning, Risk Identification, Response Management, Recovery Participation of teachers' management to the students' awareness in risk reduction, indicating that students who acquainted more tended to achieve higher students' awareness in risk reduction ($r(222) p < .05$). This suggests that increased teachers' management is associated with better students' awareness in risk reduction.

No statistically significant correlation was found between the Capacity Building of teachers' management to the students' awareness in risk reduction ($r(222) p > .05$). This indicates that, within this group, the Capacity Building of teachers' management did not significantly predict students' awareness in risk reduction, contrary to some anecdotal expectations.

Table 19. Significant correlation between the teachers' management to the students' awareness in risk reduction

Teachers' Management in Risk Reduction	Pearson Correlation	Knowledge and Understanding	Information and Exposure	Perception and Attitude	Behavioral Response	Application Knowledge
		Understanding	Exposure	Attitude	Response	Knowledge
Preparedness Planning	.192** Sig. (2-tailed) .004 N 222	.232** .000	.104 .122	.158** .018	.077 .253	
Risk Identification	.338** Sig. (2-tailed) .000 N 222	.300** .000	.228** .001	.258** .000	.210** .002	
Response Management	.196** Sig. (2-tailed) .003 N 222	.155** .021	.168** .012	.109 .105	.080 .235	
Capacity Building	.208** Sig. (2-tailed) .002 N 222	.209** .002	.081 .229	.106 .115	.081 .229	
Recovery Participation	.088 Sig. (2-tailed) .191 N 222	.137* .041	.156** .020	.144* .032	.092 .172	

Overall, the findings suggest that most dimensions of teachers' management—specifically preparedness planning,

risk identification, response management, and recovery participation—are meaningfully associated with students’ awareness of risk reduction. The significant positive correlation indicates that when teachers are more actively engaged in these areas, students tend to demonstrate higher levels of awareness, highlighting the important role of structured and proactive school management in strengthening disaster risk understanding among learners.

In contrast, capacity building did not show a statistically significant relationship with students’ awareness. This implies that, in this context, efforts focused solely on teacher training or skill development may not directly translate into improved student awareness unless they are paired with more applied and student-centered practices. Taken together, the results emphasize that practical implementation of risk management strategies in schools has a stronger influence on student awareness than capacity-building efforts alone.

Test of correlation between the teachers’ management to the students’ preparedness in risk reduction

To test the significant correlation between the teachers’ management to the students’ preparedness in risk reduction in terms of Knowledge and Safety Procedures, Participation in Drills and Training, Emergency Readiness, Response Skills, and Risk Awareness and Prevention they were treated statistically using Real Statistics Data Analysis Tools using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

Table 20 shows the significant correlation between the teachers’ management to the students’ preparedness in risk reduction.

Table 20. Significant correlation between the teachers’ management to the students’ preparedness in risk reduction

Teachers’ Management in Risk Reduction		Knowledge Participation and Safety in Drills and Emergency Response and				Risk
		Procedures Training	Participation Training	Readiness Skills	Awareness and Prevention	
Preparedness Planning	Pearson Correlation	.089	.063	.200**	.176**	.182**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.186	.350	.003	.009	.007
	N	222	222	222	222	222
Risk Identification	Pearson Correlation	.232**	.192**	.261**	.199**	.245**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.004	.000	.003	.000
	N	222	222	222	222	222
Response Management	Pearson Correlation	.084	.105	.200**	.176**	.184**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.213	.119	.003	.009	.006
	N	222	222	222	222	222
Capacity Building	Pearson Correlation	.079	.090	.241**	.162**	.212**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.241	.182	.000	.016	.001
	N	222	222	222	222	222
Recovery Participation	Pearson Correlation	.128	.079	.116	.188**	.121
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.057	.241	.085	.005	.072
	N	222	222	222	222	222

A significant positive correlation was observed between the Preparedness Planning, Risk Identification, Response Management, Capacity Building of teachers’ management to the students’ preparedness in risk reduction, indicating that students who acquainted more tended to achieve higher students’ preparedness in risk reduction ($r(222) p < .05$). This suggests that increased teachers’ management is associated with better students’ preparedness in risk reduction.

No statistically significant correlation was found between the Recovery Participation of teachers’ management to the students’ preparedness in risk reduction ($r(222) p > .05$). This indicates that, within this group, the Recovery Participation of teachers’ management did not significantly predict students’ preparedness in risk reduction, contrary to some anecdotal expectations.

The results indicate that most aspects of teachers’ management—namely preparedness planning, risk identification, response management, and capacity building—are significantly and positively related to students’ preparedness in risk reduction. This suggests that when teachers actively engage in planning, identifying risks, managing responses, and enhancing their competencies, students are more likely to develop stronger preparedness skills. These findings highlight the importance of comprehensive and proactive teacher involvement in fostering students’ readiness to respond to potential risks.

However, recovery participation did not show a statistically significant relationship with students’ preparedness. This implies that involvement in post-disaster recovery activities may not directly influence how prepared students feel or act before a risk occurs. It is possible that recovery-focused efforts are less visible or less emphasized in everyday school practices, thereby limiting their impact on students’ preparedness. Overall, the findings underscore that preventive and capacity-focused strategies have a more direct role in enhancing students’ preparedness than recovery-oriented activities.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a significant relationship between teachers’ management and student awareness in risk reduction. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This infers that teachers’ management and student awareness underscores the importance of implementing educational strategies in keeping schools safe and ready for disasters. Nonetheless, despite these favorable perceptions, disparities in confidence levels and access to formal training indicate the necessity for more uniform and thorough capacity-building programs to enhance teachers’ competencies, especially in practical application and emergency response.

There is a significant relationship between teachers’ management and student preparedness. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. This infers that teachers’ management and student preparedness have a good understanding of DRR concepts, a positive attitude toward safety practices and know how to act during drills and emergencies. Also, students learn about DRR through school activities and show that they can use whatever they’ve learned in real life. However, there are

still some areas that need to be improved, such as critical thinking, the ability to respond on their own, active participation in training and helping others in emergencies.

Based on the drawn conclusions resulted in the following recommendations.

School heads may have regular and thorough training programs, workshops, and seminars that teach students how to prepare for disasters, identify risks, and respond to emergencies. Also, school heads may do drills and simulations more often and in a more realistic way to help both teachers and students get better at responding. Lastly, school heads may regularly check and rate how well DRR programs and

activities are working to find the problems and to make sure that they are always getting better.

Further studies about disaster risk reduction and management are encouraged among future researchers in order to improve and broaden disaster management knowledge and skills. Also, future researchers may think additional variables for their study to enhance their readings of corresponding work, which could support the current research initiative's conclusions even more.

REFERENCE

- 1) Surjan and Shaw (2020), *Managing and Responding to Pandemics in Higher Educational Institutions: Initial Learning from COVID-19*.