

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2025, Vol. 6, No. 10, 4963 – 4973

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.10.09>

Research Article

Elementary School Heads' Profile, Level of Competence, and Experiences in Crisis Management

Flordeliza C. Domingo^{1*}, Vida V. Antonio²

¹Vintar Central Elementary School, 2915, Philippines

²College of Teacher Education, Mariano Marcos State University, 2900, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 25 August 2025

Revised 30 September 2025

Accepted 23 October 2025

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

flordeliza.domingo@deped.gov.ph

ABSTRACT

Crisis management is a vital competency for elementary school heads amid increasing emergencies that disrupt education. This study assessed the profile, competence, and experiences of 150 public elementary school heads in Ilocos Norte, Laoag City, and Batac City, Philippines, using a descriptive research design using validated questionnaire and interviews. Results showed that most respondents were female, aged 41–60, with master's units or degrees and more than ten years of service. They demonstrated a proficient level of competence in the four phases of crisis management: mitigation and prevention, preparedness, response, and recovery, with notable strengths in preparing drills, communication, and recovery routines, but gaps in mitigation strategies, crisis communication, suicide prevention, and psychosocial support. Qualitative findings revealed recurring challenges, including limited funding, insufficient crisis-specific training, and weak coordination with external agencies. These results suggest that while school heads are generally competent, their capacities are not yet fully developed to meet the demands of complex crises. The study recommends the establishment of a Comprehensive Crisis Management Program (CCMP) that emphasizes proactive planning, effective communication protocols, psychosocial support systems, and collaboration with local government units to enhance school resilience and ensure the safety and well-being of learners and staff.

Keywords: Crisis management, Elementary school heads, Experiences, Level of competence, Profil

Background

In schools, preparedness is vital to safeguard learning continuity, particularly for children who are among the most vulnerable

during crises and disasters. To reduce educational disruption, schools must adopt proactive measures to maintain routine, structure, and psychosocial stability for learners. In the

How to cite:

Domingo, F. C. & Antonio, V. V. (2025). Elementary School Heads' Profile, Level of Competence, and Experiences in Crisis Management. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 6(10), 4963 – 4973. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.06.10.09

Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd, 2022) has underscored the importance of sustaining learning services during prolonged school closures, which may increase risks such as teenage pregnancy, abuse, and diminished access to essential services (UNESCO, 2017). Ensuring that education continues amid natural disasters, armed conflicts, and pandemics reflects the need for strong crisis leadership in the Philippine school system. This study therefore, focuses on the profile, level of competence, and experiences in crisis management among public elementary school heads in Ilocos Norte, Laoag City, and Batac City, providing empirical evidence on how school leaders cope with crisis demands and where professional support may be strengthened.

Related Literature

Crisis leadership in education has been widely discussed in global literature, underscoring its role in mitigating harm and ensuring the safety and well-being of both learners and educators. Schools must adopt comprehensive and proactive crisis management systems that enable immediate, coordinated responses to threats and hazards (Marker, 2020; Bundy et al., 2017; Coombs, 2015). However, many school administrators remain underprepared to manage large-scale or complex emergencies due to insufficient training, limited experience, or the absence of standardized procedures. Recent studies reveal that leadership challenges during pandemics and school-based crises continue to expose these gaps (Harris, 2020; Mutch et al., 2015; McCarty, 2012).

These works provide an international perspective on the necessity of strengthening crisis preparedness in educational institutions. They emphasize that effective crisis management requires not only immediate response but also preventive planning, stakeholder communication, and collaboration with external agencies. While these findings are valuable, their contextual application must be examined in the Philippine setting, where schools face recurring hazards such as typhoons, earthquakes, and public health emergencies. By integrating insights from global research with the realities of local schools, this study seeks to build a more context-specific understanding of the

competence and experiences of elementary school heads in crisis management.

Methods

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to assess the level of crisis management competence of elementary school heads in the Schools Division Offices of Laoag City, Batac City, and Ilocos Norte. The descriptive approach was used to systematically describe the respondents' socio-demographic characteristics, the management-related crises they encountered, and their competence in the four phases of crisis management: prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. This design was deemed appropriate as it enabled the researcher to analyze the current status of the school heads' crisis management competence without manipulating variables.

Population and Sampling

The respondents of the study were 150 public elementary school heads from the Schools Division Offices of the City of Batac, Laoag City, and Ilocos Norte who assumed educational leadership roles from January 2018 up to the present. Initially, 248 school heads were identified, but only 198 responded, and 150 were qualified based on the inclusion criteria. The sample included School Principals and Head Teachers occupying official school head positions during the specified period. For qualitative data gathering, 40 school heads were purposively selected from the 20 districts of Ilocos Norte, six from Laoag City, and four from the City of Batac.

Research Instruments

The principal tool for data collection was a structured survey questionnaire composed of three sections. The first part gathered the socio-demographic information of the respondents, such as age, sex, civil status, administrative position, years of service, educational attainment, and training related to crisis management. The second part contained a checklist of management-related crises experienced during the last five years. The third part made use of the standardized School Heads' Crisis Management Competence Assessment patterned

after McCarty (2012), which measured competence across the four phases of crisis management. Responses were rated using a four-point Likert scale: 3.26–4.00 – Highly Proficient/Highly Competent; 2.51–3.25 – Proficient/Competent; 1.76–2.50 – Basic/Average; and 1.00–1.75 – Below Basic/Low (Espiritu et al., 2021). To validate the instrument, it underwent face and content review by a panel of experts, followed by a pilot test to establish its reliability. In addition, semi-structured interview guides were employed to collect qualitative data on the experiences and challenges of school heads in crisis management.

Data Gathering Procedure

Prior to the conduct of data collection, the researcher sought approval from the University Research Ethics Review Board and obtained clearance from the Schools Division Superintendents of Laoag City, Batac City, and Ilocos Norte. Participants were given consent forms that explained the goals of the study, the potential benefits and minimal risks, and emphasized their voluntary participation, including the option to withdraw at any stage. Questionnaires were distributed through both Google Forms and printed copies, depending on the schools' internet accessibility. In addition, semi-structured interviews were administered either face-to-face or through online platforms, following health protocols and the availability of the respondents.

Ethical Considerations

The study complied with established ethical standards in conducting research. The anonymity and confidentiality of respondents were protected by assigning codes rather than using their names in the presentation of results. Access to the raw data was restricted to the researcher and the dissertation committee. All information provided by participants was handled with strict confidentiality and was utilized exclusively for academic purposes. To maintain academic honesty, proper acknowledgment of sources was practiced, and the Turnitin Similarity Index software was employed to verify the originality of the manuscript.

Results

This section presents the results/findings of the Findings of the study.

Table 1 presents the distribution of management-related crises reported by the school heads. The most frequently encountered issues were ICT-related problems (382), natural hazards (287), and health-related crises (277). Financial illiteracy was also a notable concern with 217 reports, while psychological and social issues (138) and media and information illiteracy (131) were moderately reported. The least common were human-induced hazards, with only 28 cases documented.

Table 1. Distribution of management-related crises reported by the school heads.

Crises	f
A. Natural Hazards (earthquake, typhoon, landslide, flash flood, storm surge, drought)	287
B. Human-Induced Hazard (hostage-taking, terrorism, arson, kidnapping, bomb threats, teacher's conflict, student absenteeism)	28
C. Media and Information Illiteracy (fake news, cyber-attacks, child pornography, scamming, account hacking)	131
D. Psychological and Social Moral Problem (bullying, depression, suicide, attempted suicide, teenage pregnancy, psychological disorder, stress)	138
E. Health-Related Crisis (Covid-19, dengue, malnutrition, chicken pox/measles, diabetes, asthma, obesity, allergies, kidney ailment, hyperthyroidism, FHMD)	277
F. Financial Illiteracy (stealing among pupils, lack of financial support from parents, financial scam, loans, debt)	217
G. ICT-Related Problems (computers /printers/photocopies breakdown, poor internet connectivity, teacher shortage, lack of ICT equipment, lack of ICT technical staff, substitute teachers, and training of teachers)	382

Table 2 presents the four levels of crisis management competence among school heads. Overall, the respondents demonstrated a proficient level of competence (total mean = 3.12). Across the four phases, the composite means ranged from 3.04 to 3.17, all within the proficient range. In the Prevention and Mitigation phase, school heads showed strength in collaborating with external agencies ($M = 3.29$) but scored lower in implementing suicide prevention programs ($M = 2.71$). In the Preparedness phase, competence was highest in conducting emergency drills ($M = 3.26$), while relatively

lower ratings were observed in developing a crisis communication plan ($M = 2.92$) and creating board policies ($M = 2.76$). In the Response phase, they performed well in addressing security and safety needs ($M = 3.35$) and stakeholder communication ($M = 3.26$), but rated lower in unified command coordination ($M = 3.01$). In the Recovery phase, school heads excelled in conducting post-crisis safety audits ($M = 3.29$), yet showed comparatively lower competence in assessing emotional needs ($M = 3.15$).

Table 2. The level of crisis management competence of the school heads.

Prevention and Mitigation Phase		
A. Prevention and Mitigation Activities	Mean	DI
1. Conduct a safety audit.	3.13	P/C
2. Establish a prevention planning team.	3.06	P/C
3. Collaborate with outside emergency response agencies.	3.29	HP/ HC
4. Implement a bullying prevention program.	3.20	HP/ HC
5. Implement a suicide prevention program.	2.71	P/C
Composite Mean	3.08	P/C
Preparedness Phase		
B. Preparedness Activities	Mean	DI
1. Create a crisis plan.	3.01	P/C
2. Define roles and responsibilities of the crisis team	3.09	P/C
3. Develop a crisis communication plan.	2.92	P/C
4. Plan action steps for placing a school in lockdown.	3.19	P/C
5. Prepare emergency drills and crisis exercises for staff, students, and emergency responders.	3.26	HP/ HC
6. Create board policy and procedures.	2.76	P/C
Composite Mean	3.04	P/C
Response Phase		
C. Response Activities	Mean	DI
1. Assume role of incident commander and respond to crisis.	3.08	P/C
2. Consider security and safety needs.	3.35	HP/ HP
3. Document action during response.	3.23	P/C
4. Communicate with all stakeholders.	3.26	HP/ HC
5. Facilitate assistance to victims and the crisis team, i.e., medical, psychological, and basic support.	3.07	P/C
6. Work with other incident commanders in a unified command system.	3.01	P/C
7. Notify appropriate emergency responders.	3.19	P/C
8. Evacuate a school to a safe location.	3.18	P/C
Composite Mean	3.17	P/C
Recovery Phase		
D. Recovery Activities	Mean	DI
1. Return school environment to a calm routine as quickly as appropriate.	3.22	P/C
2. Conduct a safety audit after a crisis to determine if repairs are necessary.	3.29	HP/ HC

3. Communicate with media and community.	3.19	P/C
4. Assess emotional needs of staff, students, families, and responders.	3.15	P/C
5. Evaluate and consider future implications of crisis and response.	3.08	P/C
Composite Mean	3.17	P/C
Total Mean	3.12	P/C

Discussion

This part provides the analysis and interpretation of the socio-demographic characteristics, the management-related crises, the level of crisis management competence, and the experiences in crisis management of the school heads.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

The socio-demographic profile of the school heads was described in terms of age, sex, civil status, administrative position, years of service as school head, educational attainment, and attendance in seminars or training on crisis management.

Age. The mean age of the school heads was 52.37, which places them in the older age bracket. A majority (64.00%) were between 51 and 60 years old, while 26.66% fell within the 41 to 50 range. No respondents were recorded in the 21 to 30 category. The relatively low standard deviation (6.34) indicates little variation in age distribution. These results are comparable to the findings of Mangulabnan et al. (2012), who reported an average of 51.30 years among school heads. On the other hand, Babasoro (2011) observed that most principals were slightly younger, between 40 to 49 years old.

Sex. It is found that 56.67% of school heads were female, reflecting the increasing representation of women in education, both in the Philippines and globally. Concerns about the lack of male teachers and role models for young males persist, potentially impacting academic performance.

Civil Status. The majority of the respondents (78%) were married, while 16.67% were single, and 5.33% were widowed. Having a sta-

ble marital status may provide personal support systems that can enhance professional effectiveness.

Administrative Position. Most respondents held School Principal I or Head Teacher III positions, possibly limiting higher-level career opportunities.

Number of Years as School Head. Respondents had 6 to 15 years of administrative experience, reflecting common tenure and experience requirements for school head positions.

Educational Attainment. 50% had a bachelor's degree with master's units, 17.33% completed master's degrees, and 6.67% held doctoral degrees. Master's programs are pursued for personal development and career advancement, but they can be challenging.

Trainings Attended. Few respondents had crisis management training, emphasizing the need for such training to handle crises effectively in educational settings.

Management-Related Crises Reported by the School Heads

Table 1 highlights various management-related crises confronted by school heads in La-aoag City, City of Batac, and Ilocos Norte. These crises encompass a range of challenges that school heads must address to ensure the smooth operation of educational institutions.

As presented in Table 1, the most frequently encountered issues are related to ICT, which includes computer/printer/photocopies breakdown, poor internet connectivity, teacher shortage, lack of ICT equipment, lack of ICT technical staff, substitute teachers, and training of teachers. According to Antonio and Lorenzo (2019), ICT is a vital tool in the management of

schools, but many administrators face difficulties in sustaining its use due to limited resources, inadequate infrastructure, and insufficient technical support. This aligns with the results of Antonio and Lorenzo (2019), which confirm that ICT challenges remain a significant barrier to effective school management, explaining why ICT-related issues emerged as the most frequently reported crisis in Table 1. Furthermore, their study on Ilocano administrators revealed that while school leaders recognize the importance of ICT in enhancing management efficiency, they often struggle with challenges such as outdated equipment, unstable internet connections, and the lack of continuous ICT-related training. These findings affirm that ICT-related concerns are not only persistent but also central to the effectiveness of school management, underscoring the urgent need for improved investment in ICT infrastructure and capacity building among school personnel.

The second most reported crises were natural hazards (287 cases), such as earthquakes, typhoons, landslides, and flash floods. This is not surprising, considering the Philippines' geographical location in the Pacific Ring of Fire and its exposure to frequent typhoons (Santos, 2021). School heads face constant pressure to ensure both structural safety and continuity of learning during and after such disasters.

Considering that the Philippines, this may be

The third set of frequently encountered crises was health-related and psychosocial issues (277 and 138 cases, respectively). These include COVID-19, dengue, malnutrition, bullying, depression, and teenage pregnancy. The COVID-19 pandemic, in particular, magnified the vulnerability of schools to health crises, disrupting traditional teaching and forcing a shift to alternative modalities. This aligns with the findings of Miranda and Tolentino (2023), who emphasized that Filipino learners experienced significant stress, anxiety, and disruptions in learning due to the pandemic.

Overall, the distribution in Table 1 demonstrates that while ICT crises dominate in frequency, other categories, particularly natural hazards and health-related issues, also present

substantial challenges. Each type of crisis requires specific competencies and preparedness strategies from school heads, highlighting the complex and multidimensional nature of crisis management in educational institutions.

Crisis Management Competence of School Heads

Findings from the survey highlight the competence of school heads in crisis management, examined across four phases: prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery.

The study evaluated the competence of school heads in the prevention and mitigation phase of crisis management, with results in Table 2 showing a satisfactory level of competence and an overall mean score of 3.14. High proficiency was observed in areas related to communication, ensuring a safe school environment, identifying potential incidents, and promoting student participation. Despite these strengths, lower ratings were recorded in safety audits, prevention programs, and assessing the school's emotional climate.

The participants' statements illustrate these gaps. One respondent shared:

I do not know how to conduct a safety audit particularly in conducting a threat assessment of violence, identify outside threats, identify factors related to school violence and to assess the school's emotional climate

- School Head

Another acknowledged:

I really admit that I neglect to establish a prevention planning team particularly a multidisciplinary threat assessment team. Our school just rely to the services of the School DRRM Coordinator

- School Head 2

These admissions highlight the importance of training support in technical areas of risk assessment and team organization.

The relatively lower mean scores in establishing multidisciplinary threat assessment teams and implementing suicide prevention programs emphasize the need for stronger initiatives in these areas. A multidisciplinary threat assessment team is vital for proactively identifying and addressing risks, while suicide prevention programs require comprehensive efforts such as staff development, student support, collaboration with mental health professionals, and communication with parents (Ayer & Colpe, 2023). These measures are essential for improving prevention and mitigation practices in schools.

Crisis Management Competence on Preparedness Phase

The results in Table 2 show that the school heads attained a composite mean of 3.07, which indicates proficiency in the preparedness phase of crisis management. The highest rating was observed in conducting drills and readiness checks ($M = 3.49$), demonstrating their commitment to evaluating response measures and strengthening school preparedness. Competence was also evident in formulating crisis plans ($M = 3.01$) and assigning roles within crisis teams ($M = 3.09$), providing a reliable foundation for readiness activities. On the other hand, lower mean scores were obtained in establishing a rumor hotline, planning debriefings for crisis teams, and addressing logistical and policy matters, which point to specific areas requiring improvement to achieve comprehensive preparedness and ensure the safety of learners and staff.

Qualitative responses reinforce these findings. One respondent admitted:

Our school is not prepared for any disaster or crisis that may happen. There are no plans to undertake, no necessary equipment, and no permanent emergency fund

- *School Head 5*

Another added:

Schools do not have the training to provide security to schoolchildren and school staff in case of an emergency.

- *School Head*

These statements reflect how the lack of resources and training limits the ability of schools to respond effectively.

The relatively lower scores in developing a crisis communication plan carry important implications for preparedness. A structured plan is vital to facilitate communication and information flow during emergencies, while rumor hotlines help manage misinformation. Regular debriefings after crises allow continuous improvement, and clear board policies address issues of accountability and liability. Likewise, establishing a permanent emergency fund is crucial to ensure that schools are financially capable of responding to and recovering from crises. These results underscore the need to prioritize communication strategies, financial planning, and institutional policies, supported by training and collaboration with experts, to strengthen preparedness in schools.

Crisis Management Competence on Response Phase

The results in Table 2 reveal that the school heads obtained a composite mean of 3.15 in the response phase, which reflects competence in managing crises. They performed well in six of the nine indicators, including assuming the role of incident commander, documenting actions during response, extending support to victims and the crisis team, coordinating with other incident commanders through a unified system, notifying emergency responders, and carrying out school evacuations to safe areas. High proficiency was also recorded in two aspects: addressing security and safety concerns ($M = 3.35$) and maintaining communication with stakeholders ($M = 3.26$). These ratings demonstrate the school heads' ability to implement safety measures and maintain clear information-sharing during emergencies, both of which are essential for protecting students and staff.

Despite these strengths, certain activities received lower ratings, pointing to areas that require further development. Several school heads acknowledged difficulties in handling complex response tasks. One respondent admitted

I am innocent in assessing a crisis, I don't know how to decompose an issue

to identify the steps necessary to address the crises.

- *School Head 5*

Another noted:

I need further training in sizing up the crisis to make a rapid decision in modifying a recent plan

- *School Head 1*

Similarly, a participant confessed:

I am not ready to size up the situation and make rapid decisions to develop alternative solutions to a problem.

- *School Head*

These statements reveal a need for additional training in decision-making and rapid assessment during crisis situations.

The relatively lower mean scores in facilitating assistance to victims and supporting crisis teams underline the importance of strengthening these components. Providing timely medical, psychological, and basic support during crises is a responsibility that requires both resources and training. Likewise, collaboration with other incident commanders in a unified system ensures coordinated action, particularly in complex emergencies. To build competence in the response phase, school heads would benefit from targeted programs on victim assistance, crisis intervention, unified command operations, and team support. Such initiatives would improve their capacity to manage crises more effectively and with greater compassion.

Crisis Management Competence on Recovery Phase

The findings in Table 6 indicate that the school heads reached a composite mean of 3.17 in the recovery phase, reflecting their competence in this area of crisis management. They performed well in restoring the school environment to a stable routine, maintaining communication with the media and the community, and recognizing the emotional needs of students, staff, families, and responders. Their strongest performance was in conducting

safety audits after a crisis ($M = 3.29$), showing their ability to assess facilities and address needed repairs. Other aspects of recovery where competence was evident included identifying individuals vulnerable to psychological stress, offering crisis intervention, and evaluating recovery practices to strengthen preparedness.

Despite these strengths, several school heads noted difficulties in providing full psychosocial support. One respondent admitted:

I confess that I need to learn to assess the emotional needs of my staff and students to identify who are at risk of psychological trauma

- *School Head 10*

Another explained:

The school is incapable of providing the opportunity for crisis intervention and stress management to the pupils, and teachers.

- *School Head 8*

Such feedback points to the importance of enhancing the schools' capacity to respond to the emotional and psychological impact of crises.

Overall, the results suggest that recovery competence can be further developed. While the respondents were effective in reinstating order and conducting post-crisis safety reviews, there is a need for stronger long-term strategies. Maintaining open communication with stakeholders is essential for building trust, but equal attention should be given to evaluating the lasting effects of crises and integrating lessons learned into future planning. Activities such as post-crisis debriefings and recognition of crisis anniversaries may also support the resilience and healing of school communities.

School Head's Experiences in Crisis Management

Responses from the unstructured interviews revealed several key themes regarding school crisis management, including crisis management planning, data-driven approaches, and professional development.

Crisis Management Planning. The school heads highlighted the importance of having comprehensive crisis management plans. Such plans encompass threat assessment, structured protocols, and immediate response measures to ensure the safety of both students and staff.

Having a well-thought-out crisis management plan is essential for schools. It allows us to anticipate potential crises and have a systematic approach to handle them.

- *School Head 8*

The presence of a crisis management plan makes every organization ready to respond in any case of crisis. All schools must consider putting up a plan to reduce damages.

- *School Head 11*

Crisis management plans in schools help employees adopt a specific approach, enabling the whole organization to work as a team to make the school free from crises.

- *School Head 16*

Some school heads shared negative experiences when crises occurred without sufficient planning:

I can't imagine how our school survived Typhoon Ompong where many roofs were blown off. We didn't have a ready plan then.

- *School Head 17*

We had a ready plan, but when a strong earthquake struck, it turned out that our plan was insufficient.

- *School Head 12*

Data-Driven Approaches. Respondents emphasized the use of data to inform decision-making and crisis management strategies. Data sources such as IPPD, ESAT results, IPCRF, and Instructional Supervisory Plans were cited as important for identifying potential risks and guiding proactive measures.

By analyzing data related to student performance, behavior, and other factors, we can identify potential risks and take proactive measures to prevent crises.

- *School Head 18*

Sufficient data are necessary to support assessment of violence in school. Without enough data, claims on violence would not be resolved.

- *School Head 20*

Professional Development. The significance of professional development in crisis management was repeatedly noted. School heads reported attending training sessions, technical assistance programs, and workshops organized by the Department of Education (DepEd) and other agencies, which enhanced their knowledge and competence in handling crises.

Attending professional development programs and workshops provided by DepEd and other agencies can enhance participants' knowledge and competence.

- *School Head 23*

There are tutorials available online spearheaded by DepEd, and these can help us manage crises better.

- *School Head 23*

Definitely, we could learn from experience, but training on how to manage and handle crises makes us more competent and skilled.

- *School Head 24*

However, several respondents noted the limited availability of crisis-specific trainings:

DepEd has not conducted seminars and training on community-based crisis management. School heads are left to handle crises on their own.

- *School Head 25*

Crisis management seems neglected, even as the number and complexity of crises increase.

- School Head 26

Overall, these responses underscore the importance of proactive planning, utilizing data, and continuous professional development to create a safe and secure school environment, ensuring timely and appropriate responses to emergencies.

Schools today face multiple challenges, including stricter regulations, compliance requirements, and increasing uncertainty during crises. To manage risks effectively, organizations must adopt proactive approaches, anticipate future threats, and make informed decisions quickly. Using a data-driven approach allows for objective decision-making, enabling schools to measure the effectiveness of interventions and adjust strategies as needed.

Proactive planning reduces stress, improves organizational efficiency, and enhances the ability to manage both existing and emerging risks. Part of this approach includes professional development, which equips school staff with the knowledge and skills needed to build stronger, more cohesive teams. Together, proactive planning, data-driven strategies, and professional development contribute to creating a safe and secure learning environment for both students and staff.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that while elementary school heads in Ilocos Norte, Laoag City, and Batac City are competent in managing crises, their capacity remains uneven across the four phases of crisis management. The findings imply an urgent need for policies that formalize crisis management as a core leadership function and institutionalize continuous training in this area. In practice, schools require stronger systems for psychosocial support, communication protocols, and financial readiness to ensure that crisis response is not left to individual discretion but embedded in organizational structures. For research, future studies may focus on evaluating the long-term effectiveness of school-based crisis management programs,

particularly in the Philippine context, where recurring disasters and public health emergencies directly affect educational continuity.

Recommendations

A structured crisis management program that focuses on emergency preparedness, crisis planning, risk reduction, and recovery, tailored to local hazards such as typhoons, earthquakes, and health emergencies, must be developed based on the results. This must be participated by all elementary school heads. Regular simulation exercises and drills should be conducted to enhance practical skills, communication, and multidisciplinary coordination. Schools must maintain updated crisis management plans aligned with national and local protocols and be provided with adequate resources, including emergency funds, safety equipment, and relevant training. Additionally, professional development opportunities should be expanded to address gaps in suicide prevention, psychosocial support, financial readiness, and crisis communication. Implementing these measures will strengthen school resilience and ensure the safety and continuity of learning during emergencies.

References

Antonio, V., & Lorenzo, N. (2019). Ilocano Administrators' adoption and use of ICT in the management of public secondary schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 7(2). https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=9jrOPqEAAAJ&citation_for_view=9jrOPqEAAAJ:u-x6o8ySG0sC

Ayer, L., & Colpe, L. J. (2023). The key role of schools in youth suicide prevention. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 62(1), 19–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaac.2022.06.022>

Babasoro, A.D. (2011). *Leadership Styles of Private Elementary School Principals*.

Bundy, J., Pfarrer, M. D., Short, C. E., & Coombs, W. T. (2017). Crises and crisis manage-

ment: Integration, interpretation, and research development. *Journal of Management*, 43(6), 1661–1692.

Coombs, T. (2015). *The value of communication during a crisis: Insights from strategic communication research*. https://econpapers.repec.org/article/eee-bushor/v_3a58_3ay_3a2015_3ai_3a2_3ap_3a141-148.htm

Department of Education (2022). *DepEd develops learning recovery plan as more schools conduct face-to-face classes*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2022/03/29/deped-develops-learning-recovery-plan-as-more-schools-conduct-face-to-face-classes/>

Espiritu, A. I., Sy, M. C. C., Anlakan, V. M. M., Jamora, R. D. G., Macalintal, C. M. S. A., Robles, J. B., Cataniag, P. L., Flores, M. K. C., Tangcuangco-Trinidad, N. J. C., Juangco, D. N. A., Paas, G. R. G., Chua, A. M. U., Estrada, V. S., Mejia, P. R. P., Reyes, T. F. B., Cañete, M. T. A., Zapata, F. R. A., Castillo, F. E. B., Esagunde, R. U., . . . Sali, M. E. S. (2021). COVID-19 outcomes of 10,881 patients: retrospective study of neurological symptoms and associated manifestations (Philippine CORONA Study). *Journal of Neural Transmission*, 128(11), 1687–1703. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00702-021-02400-5>

Harris, A. (2020). Covid-19 - school leadership in crisis? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 5(3-4), 321–326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPCC-06-2020-0045>

Mangulabnan, B., Dela Rosa, R. and Vargas, D. (2021). *Transformational leadership styles of school principals in Central Luzon, Philippines*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3804879>

Marker, A. (2020). *Models and Theories to Improve Crisis Management*. <https://www.smartsheet.com/content/crisis-management-model-theories>

McCarty (2012). *K-12 School leaders and school crisis: An exploration of principals' school crisis competencies and preparedness*. http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/12030/1/mccarty_published_dissertation_2012.pdf?cv=1

Miranda, J. P. P., & Tolentino, J. C. G. (2023). Impact of COVID-19 and emotional states of Filipino university students. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 12(3), 1195. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v1i3.24707>

Mutch, C., McLeod, S. & Dulsky, S. (2015). *Leadership in times of crisis: Dispositional, relational, and contextual factors influencing school principals' actions*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282621429_Leadership_in_times_of_crisis_Dispositional_relational_and_contextual_factors_influencing_school_principals'_actions

UNESCO. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: leaning objectives*, France: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. ISBN 978-92-3-100209