

SCHOOL CRISIS MANAGEMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY STUDENTS AT GUIMARAS STATE COLLEGE

**Kert D. Pillora, Femaerose S. Ga
Rodrigo G. Paglomutan Jr.**

ABSTRACT This study was conducted to determine the level of school crisis management among criminology students. The subject-respondents of the study were the criminology students of Guimaras State College in terms of age, sex, year level, family monthly income, boarding status, scholarship, and religion. Likewise, the relationship between the extent of school crisis and the crisis management of the criminology students were determined. The CCJE students of Guimaras State College was experiencing a moderate level of school crisis in both environmental and organizational sources while a low to moderate school crisis level for personal school crisis has been experienced but the disagreement of the majority has been identified for mean school crisis level values of organizational and personal sources while their positive agreement was observed in environmental school crisis. A no significant difference was found for every the profile variable sub-group. Crisis management was a strategy of the individual in order to cope-up or relieve from the experienced school crisis from different sources. The CCJE students were directly stated the agreement if sublimation mechanism as applicable for the three sources as their response was agreed but noticeably it could be applicable for experiencing organizational school crisis. For the introjection crisis management, the overall response of CCJE students was undecided to apply this type of coping in the three identified sources but still considerable as their crisis management as it was positively agreed by the majority. Regression, projection and displacement crisis management was disagreed by the respondents for its applicability to cope up school crisis from the identified sources. As the level of organizational stress experienced by the respondent increases the more they engage in introjection, projection, regression, and displacement coping mechanism and as the level of personal stress increases the more the respondents will engage to projection and introjection.

Keywords: School Crisis, Management, Criminology Students.

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Crisis in the workplace is a worldwide issue. A report on Education by World Bank (1999) revealed that the education systems the world over have been ineffective and has failed to address the matter of student's crisis and burnout in schools. This failure, however, has stifled natural efforts towards building a stronger human resource base which is invaluable for development in all its spheres in schools (Yamboet.al., 2012).

In spite of the studies conducted in determining factors of the crisis in some foreign countries, there is no concrete basis to conclude that crisis-related problem at work with students in school is the same experience in the Philippines. There should have a study locally that would prove its sources and its eventual effects to school supervision. Thus, this study was conducted.

Considering the heavy study load in the school of the students are experiencing today, determining the extent of crisis of criminology students is therefore indispensable. Likewise, this study would help determine the consequent crisis management of the Criminology students' specifically at Guimaras State College which will be the basis for the improvement of human resource program of the Department of Criminal Justice Education. Its significance will not only for the professional enhancement but its relevance will benefit the students as well as the institution by refining its human resource program.

Statement of the problem

This study was conducted to determine the level of crisis management among criminology students and its impact to school supervision. Specifically, this study would answer the following questions:

1. What is the socio-demographic profile of criminology students in Guimaras state college when grouped according to age, sex, year level, boarding status, scholarship?

2. What is the extent of crisis among the criminology students in Guimaras State College when grouped according to profile and taken as a whole in terms of Environmental, Organizational, and Personal?
3. What is the crisis management among the criminology students in Guimaras State College when grouped according to profile and taken as whole in terms of sublimation, regression, projection, introjection, and displacement?
4. Is there a significant difference between extent of crisis among the criminology students in Guimaras State College when grouped according to profile terms of Environmental, Organizational, and Personal?
5. Is there a significant difference between the crisis management among the criminology students in Guimaras State College when grouped according to profile terms of sublimation, regression, projection, introjection, and displacement?
6. Is there a significant relationship between the extent of crisis and crisis management among the criminology students in Guimaras State College?

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted the Descriptive Method of Research (Survey Research Design). This was used to describe the crisis management of the selected criminology students of Guimaras State College AY 2016-2017. According to Librero (1996), a survey research design allows to study "naturally occurring phenomena." Furthermore, a researcher collects data from a part of the population to assess the interrelationship of the variables in his/her study. Survey research is the most efficient method for gathering data that will be used to describe a very large population (Babbie, 1986).

The stratified random sampling will be used to identify actual respondents of the study. From the total population of 220 criminology students, the 144 will be the significant samples computed using Sloven's formula at 0.05 margin of error. The researcher modified the data gathering instruments from the Usdaw Health and Safety Stress Questionnaire (2013) and partly from the study of Cañete, et.al. (2007), using Survey Questionnaire as the most effective and common method in conducting survey approach. The questionnaire composed of three parts namely: Part I: seeks information about the socio-demographic profile of the respondents. Part II: determines the stress level among criminology students. Part III: aims to find out the crisis management adopted by criminology students. To establish validity of the research instrument or the questionnaire a jury composed of five panels of evaluators, who are experts in this field or who are knowledgeable in research. Using the evaluation instrument formulated by Good and Scates, the panels will provide ratings for the validity of the instrument. The mean rating of 4.36 established the validity of the instrument. To establish the reliability of the instrument used to gather data in this study, the same shall be subjected to a dry run method. The instrument will be administered once, to a group of pupils which are not belonging to the study. The dry run respondents were the randomly selected 30 non-criminology students of Guimaras State. The data will be collected, tabulated and computed using the Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test and the result of 0.93 established the reliability of the instrument.

After the instrument passes both validity and reliability tests, researchers will write a letter addressed to the Administrator of the school – A, asking permission and approval allowing the researcher to conduct a study and administer the questionnaire. After the permission and approval were granted, sufficient copies of the questionnaire were reproduced for administration to the respondents and a schedule for the administration of the instrument shall be arranged with the different section to assure the time devotion of the respondents to participate in the study.

The researchers were personally administered the instrument to the respondents. The researchers facilitate the answering of questions that respondents may have as well as to ensure the 100% retrieval of the accomplished questionnaires. Statements in the instrument were discussed so that respondents may directly understand what is being asked to them. Collected data was subjected to data analysis.

Statistical used were frequency, mean, percentage, Mann Whitney U, Kruskal Wallis set at 0.05 alpha level and Spearman Rho Correlation at 0.05 alpha level.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Profile of the Respondents

Presented in table 1 below was the profile of the respondents. Out of the total 140 students responded in the survey, there were 44.3% with an age of 17 to 19 years old, 40.0% 20 to 22 years old, and 15.7% at above 22 years old. In terms of sex, 65% were males, and 35% were females, wherein, 42.9% stay in the boarding houses and 57.1% does not have a boarding house. As to scholarship grants, 45% were public scholarship beneficiaries while 55% were private or family scholarship grantees. The result implies that majority of the respondents were at 17-22 years of age, mostly were males, does not have a boarding house, and private scholarship grantees.

Table 1. The profile of CCJE students

| Profile | | f | % |
|-----------------|--------------|-----|-------|
| Age | 17-19 | 62 | 44.3 |
| | 20-22 | 56 | 40.0 |
| | Above 22 | 22 | 15.7 |
| Sex | Male | 91 | 65.0 |
| | Female | 48 | 34.3 |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 60 | 42.9 |
| | Non-boarding | 80 | 57.1 |
| Scholarship | Public | 63 | 45.0 |
| | Private | 77 | 55.0 |
| Total | | 140 | 100.0 |

Crisis Experienced by CCJE Students

The descriptive analysis for the level of crisis experienced by CCJE students in terms of three identified source of the crisis was presented in the table below. Mean was used to describe the overall description of the crisis level per profile group.

The respondents' profile was normally a significant factor to study psychological dimensions of each individual towards perception, in which this study utilizing perception of identifying individual crisis level. Overall, respondents were showing their response to identify the crisis level they have experienced in school based on the three factors as the source of crisis; environmental, organizational and personal factors. A consistent moderate level of crisis has been experienced in both environmental and organizational factors of the different group of profile variables while a variation of crisis level has been experienced on the personal factor. The respondents with above 22 years of age, non-boarding and a public scholarship beneficiary noted a low level of crisis as to personal factor, and other profile variable groups experienced moderate crisis level.

On the organizational factor level of crisis experienced by the respondents as categorized in different profile variable sub-groups, majority of male respondents aging 17-19 years old, non-boarding, not considering the type of scholarship they belong shows their disagreement in the computed mean value of moderate crisis level; which implies they have experienced lower level of crisis than moderate in the organizational structure of their school while majority of those above 22 years old female /male respondents, boarding in status, noted their positive agreement on the mean computed value of experiencing moderate crisis level and justifying a higher level than moderate. Considering the variation of crisis-level experienced from low to moderate in terms of personal factor as describe in the table above, based on the mean value, the disagreement of the majority of the respondents in every profile variable sub-groups was consistently noted except those in public scholarship grantees in which they have noted a positive agreement and justify the low level of crisis experienced. The result implies that in terms of personal sources of crisis, the majority of the respondents experiencing a crisis level of moderate and lower and for those in public scholarship grant which majority of them may be experiencing a crisis level higher than low. Overall, the majority of respondents shows disagreement in the mean value of experiencing the moderate level of crisis from personal factor.

Table 2. The level of crisis experienced by CCJE students in terms of three identified source of crisis and grouped according to profile.

| PROFILE | | Source of crisis | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Environmental | | Organizational | | Personal | |
| | | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Age | 17-19 | 2.85 | Moderate | 2.78 | Moderate | 2.78 | Moderate |
| | 20-22 | 2.98 | Moderate | 2.8 | Moderate | 2.58 | Moderate |
| | Above 22 | 3.11 | Moderate | 2.98 | Moderate | 2.25 | Moderate |
| Sex | Male | 3.1 | Moderate | 2.84 | Moderate | 2.62 | Moderate |
| | Female | 2.88 | Moderate | 2.78 | Moderate | 2.62 | Moderate |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 2.9 | Moderate | 2.73 | Moderate | 2.63 | Moderate |
| | Non-boarding | 3.14 | Moderate | 3.14 | Moderate | 2.57 | Moderate |
| Scholarship | Public | 2.91 | Moderate | 2.8 | Moderate | 2.44 | Moderate |
| | Private | 2.96 | Moderate | 2.81 | Moderate | 2.69 | Moderate |
| Total | | 2.94 | Moderate | 2.81 | Moderate | 2.62 | Moderate |

Crisis Management of the Respondents

Crisis level identification was not being completed without determining some of the coping strategies used by the respondents to cope-up the crisis they have experienced. Presented in table 2, is the Crisis Management of CCJE students based on the identified sources of crisis.

Crisis Management is the strategy of the individual in order cope-up of relieve from the experienced crisis from different sources. One of the Crisis Management used in this was sublimation. Based on the collected information of utilizing sublimation to cope-up from environmental, organizational and personal factors of crisis from the respondents, in which they were categorized according to different profile variable as shown in table 2. In the environmental factor of crisis, the group of respondents showing their agreement of utilizing sublimation to cope-up the crisis caused by the environmental factor was those 20-22 years old non-boarding and a public scholarship grantee. While the other profile variable group were undecided or not sure of using sublimation in environmental crisis factor. In organizational crisis factor, the 20-22 years old, non-boarding, and public scholarship grantee CCJE students was agree of using sublimation Crisis Management when experiencing organizational crisis while those under groups in Sex, length of service, 17-19 and above 22 years of age, boarding, and in private scholarship were undecided of their utilization if experiencing organizational crisis. The sublimation Crisis Management has been used as a strategy of above 22 years old female non-boarding, and public scholar CCJE students. Overall respondents were still undecided or Not Sure of using sublimation type of Crisis Management for environmental, organizational and personal crisis factors.

Looking at for those profile variable groups having undecided for utilization of sublimation as Crisis Management for experiencing a crisis from three crisis factors was further analyzed to understand the individual response agreement. Based on the value of skewness, those with positive result justify the positive agreement and may implies that majority were still using the sublimation, and it was group of boarding and a private scholar CCJE students a male and female non-boarding above 22 years old private CCJE students for have also their positive agreement of utilizing sublimation for organizational factor crisis while the majority of the male college degree holder private CCJE students shows positive agreement for using same Crisis Management for personal crisis related experienced. The overall majority of the CCJE students have the positive agreement of using sublimation for organizational factor crisis related.

Table 3. The Sublimation Crisis Management of CCJE students based on their identified source of crisis and grouped according to profile variable.

| PROFILE | | Source of crisis | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Environmental | | Organizational | | Personal | |
| | | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Age | 17-19 | 3.17 | Not sure | 3.19 | Not sure | 3.08 | Not sure |
| | 20-22 | 3.44 | Agree | 3.45 | Agree | 3.55 | Agree |
| | Above 22 | 3.00 | Not sure | 3.08 | Not sure | 3.53 | Agree |
| Sex | Male | 3.33 | Not sure | 3.30 | Not sure | 3.35 | Not sure |
| | Female | 3.31 | Not sure | 3.36 | Not sure | 3.40 | Agree |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 3.29 | Not sure | 3.31 | Not sure | 3.37 | Not sure |
| | Non-boarding | 3.45 | Agree | 3.48 | Agree | 3.45 | Agree |
| Scholarship | Public | 3.74 | Agree | 3.60 | Agree | 3.61 | Agree |
| | Private | 3.15 | Not sure | 3.25 | Not sure | 3.29 | Not sure |
| Total | | 3.32 | Not sure | 3.34 | Not sure | 3.39 | Not sure |

For the utilization of regression type of Crisis Management, it was shown that based on the mean values for each of the respondents profile group and overall responses that this type of Crisis Management was not a strategy to cope-up from crisis of the CCJE students at entire profile variable groups, hence their response was disagree to strongly disagree for every crisis related factors. The overall disagreement response of the respondents for the regression Crisis Management was not a conclusion for respondents' regression strategy to cope up crisis. There were still frequent numbers of respondents from different profile group utilizing regression Crisis Management in order to relieve or to cope-up from the crisis from the stated crisis related factors.

Table 3. The regression Crisis Management of CCJE students based on their identified source of crisis and grouped according to profile variable.

| PROFILE | | Source of crisis | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Environmental | | Organizational | | Personal | |
| | | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Age | 17-19 | 2.44 | Disagree | 2.33 | Disagree | 2.40 | Disagree |
| | 20-22 | 2.23 | Disagree | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.15 | Disagree |
| | above 22 | 2.09 | Disagree | 1.93 | Disagree | 2.00 | Disagree |
| Sex | Male | 2.49 | Disagree | 2.28 | Disagree | 2.34 | Disagree |
| | Female | 2.21 | Disagree | 2.14 | Disagree | 2.18 | Disagree |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 2.34 | Disagree | 2.20 | Disagree | 2.27 | Disagree |
| | Non-Boarding | 2.09 | Disagree | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.06 | Disagree |
| Scholarship | Public | 2.24 | Disagree | 2.35 | Disagree | 2.42 | Disagree |
| | Private | 2.32 | Disagree | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.16 | Disagree |
| Total | | 2.29 | Disagree | 2.18 | Disagree | 2.23 | Disagree |

The respondents' response for projection type of Crisis Management was shown in the above table. Based on the mean values for each of the respondents' profile group and overall responses this type of Crisis Management was not a strategy to cope-up from a crisis of the CCJE students at entire profile variable groups, hence their response was at the level of disagree to strongly disagree for every crisis related factors. The overall disagreement response of the respondents for the projection Crisis Management was almost the same with regression coping results presented in the previous table above. Projection strategy to cope up crisis received a lower negative agreement response from the respondents as the skewness was negative for almost profile variable groups. The result implies that CCJE students did not consider projection to be a Crisis Management to relieve from the crisis in which the respondents experienced.

Table 4. The projection Crisis Management of CCJE students based on the identified source of crisis and grouped according to profile variable.

| PROFILE | | Source of crisis | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Environmental | | Organizational | | Personal | |
| | | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Age | 17-19 | 1.92 | Disagree | 1.99 | Disagree | 1.89 | Disagree |
| | 20-22 | 2.08 | Disagree | 2.06 | Disagree | 2.14 | Disagree |
| | Above 22 | 1.29 | Disagree | 1.67 | Disagree | 1.65 | Disagree |
| Sex | Male | 2.09 | Disagree | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.01 | Disagree |
| | Female | 1.94 | Disagree | 1.96 | Disagree | 2.03 | Disagree |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 2.04 | Disagree | 2.07 | Disagree | 2.1 | Disagree |
| | Non-boarding | 1.75 | Disagree | 1.75 | Disagree | 1.72 | Disagree |
| Scholarship | Public | 1.92 | Disagree | 1.92 | Disagree | 1.99 | Disagree |
| | Private | 2.01 | Disagree | 2.04 | Disagree | 2.04 | Disagree |
| Total | | 1.98 | Disagree | 2.01 | Disagree | 2.03 | Disagree |

Crisis Management as presented above shows almost consistent responses when the respondents were categorized or grouped into different profile variables sub-group. The computed mean values of the responses from the respondents were interpreted for each variable group, and it was found that CCJE students were undecided for determining the introjection as Crisis Management relieved crisis from the environmental, organizational and personal crisis factor for almost the entire profile groups Even though the overall response of the respondents in every profile variable groups was in the middle point level of agreement, still it could be described that there were frequent numbers of respondents used introjection to relieve crisis based on the positive value of skewness in some of the profile variable groups; specifically the 17-19 years old female private CCJE students either boarding and non-boarding.

Table 5. The introjection Crisis Management of CCJE students based on the identified source of crisis and grouped according to profile variable.

| PROFILE | | Source of crisis | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Environmental | | Organizational | | Personal | |
| | | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Age | 17-19 | 2.75 | Not Sure | 2.68 | Not Sure | 2.67 | Not Sure |
| | 20-22 | 2.92 | Not Sure | 2.96 | Not Sure | 2.95 | Not Sure |
| | Above 22 | 3.29 | Not Sure | 3 | Not Sure | 3.29 | Not Sure |
| Sex | Male | 3.11 | Not Sure | 3.04 | Not Sure | 3.08 | Not Sure |
| | Female | 2.77 | Not Sure | 2.8 | Not Sure | 2.77 | Not Sure |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 2.87 | Not Sure | 2.85 | Not Sure | 2.84 | Not Sure |
| | Non-boarding | 2.91 | Not Sure | 2.97 | Not Sure | 2.98 | Not Sure |
| Scholarship | Public | 2.97 | Not Sure | 2.95 | Not Sure | 2.96 | Not Sure |
| | Private | 2.84 | Not Sure | 2.84 | Not Sure | 2.83 | Not Sure |
| Total | | 2.88 | Not Sure | 2.87 | Not Sure | 2.87 | Not Sure |

Note: SDA-strongly disagree, DA-disagree, NOT SURE-either agree or disagree, A-agree, SA-strongly agree.

The level of agreement responses of the respondents as to the introjection type of Crisis Management

For the displacement Crisis Management it was shown that based on the mean values for each of the respondents profile group and overall responses this type of Crisis Management was not a strategy to cope-up from crisis of the CCJE students at entire profile variable groups, hence their response was disagree to strongly disagree for every crisis related factors. The overall disagreement response of the respondents for the displacement Crisis Management was not a conclusion for respondents' coping strategy to cope up crisis. There were still frequent numbers of respondents from different profile group utilizing displacement Crisis Management in order to relieve or to cope-up from the crisis from the stated crisis related factors.

Table 6. The displacement Crisis Management of CCJE students based on the identified source of crisis and grouped according to profile variable.

| PROFILE | | Source of crisis | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| | | Environmental | | Organizational | | Personal | |
| | | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation | Mean | Interpretation |
| Age | 17-19 | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.11 | Disagree |
| | 20-22 | 2.12 | Disagree | 2.3 | Disagree | 2.21 | Disagree |
| | Above 22 | 2.17 | Disagree | 2 | Disagree | 2 | Disagree |
| Sex | Male | 2.15 | Disagree | 2.17 | Disagree | 2.24 | Disagree |
| | Female | 2.1 | Disagree | 2.23 | Disagree | 2.13 | Disagree |
| Boarding status | Boarding | 2.15 | Disagree | 2.19 | Disagree | 2.2 | Disagree |
| | Non-boarding | 2 | Disagree | 2.28 | Disagree | 2 | Disagree |
| Scholarship | Public | 2.14 | Disagree | 2.27 | Disagree | 2.12 | Disagree |
| | Private | 2.11 | Disagree | 2.18 | Disagree | 2.18 | Disagree |
| Total | | 2.12 | Disagree | 2.21 | Disagree | 2.16 | Disagree |

Note: SDA-strongly disagree, DA-disagree, NOT SURE-either agree or disagree, A-agree, SA-strongly agree

The table 7 presents the results of the significant difference on the crisis level experienced by CCJE students from the given source of crisis using appropriate statistical analysis in terms of different profile variable groupings. The test was employed to further describe the homogeneity of the respondent responses.

The results of analysis using Mann Whitney U for comparing to independent groups having a scaled data and Kruskal Wallis test for more two independent groups both was tested at 0.05 alpha level. In terms of male and female, boarding and non-boarding, public and private schools, comparison of crisis-level experienced by the stated profile of administrator using the Mann Whitney U test at 0.05 alpha. The result has a computed significant value of greater than 0.05 which resulted to the interpretation of no significant difference on the crisis level of the tested independent two groups for every source of the crisis that come up with the decision of accepting the null hypothesis. Therefore it is concluded that in terms of Sex, civil status and type of school of the respondents was homogeneous in the level of crisis experienced based on the different source of crisis.

The result of no significant difference was also obtained in comparing more two independent groups of age, length of service and highest educational attainment. The result implies the homogeneity of the responses as to the crisis level experienced by the different profile variable sub-group.

Table 7. The significant difference test on the level of crisis experienced by CCJE students as grouped according to profile.

| Variables | Environmental | | | Organizational | | | Personal | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------|-----------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|----------|---------|-----------------|
| | Tabular | p-value | interpretation | Tabular | p-value | interpretation | Tabular | p-value | Interpretation |
| Sex | -1.250 | 0.210 | Not significant | -0.720 | 0.470 | Not significant | -0.260 | 0.800 | Not significant |
| Boarding Status | -0.670 | 0.500 | Not significant | -1.530 | 0.130 | Not significant | -0.020 | 0.990 | Not significant |
| Scholarship | -0.770 | 0.440 | Not significant | -0.040 | 0.970 | Not significant | -0.960 | 0.340 | Not significant |
| Age | 0.220 | 0.900 | Not significant | 0.020 | 0.990 | Not significant | 3.130 | 0.210 | Not significant |

The results of analysis using Mann Whitney U for comparing to independent groups having a scaled data and Kruskal Wallis test for more two independent groups both was tested at 0.05 alpha level. In terms of boarding and non-boarding, public and private schools, comparison of Crisis Management from crisis level experienced by CCJE students in terms of the stated profile of using the Mann Whitney U test at 0.05 alpha. The result has a computed significant value of greater than 0.05 which resulted to the interpretation of no significant difference between the Crisis Management used based crisis level experienced of the tested independent two groups, therefore, come up with the decision of accepting the null hypothesis. Therefore it is concluded that in terms of civil status and type of school of the respondents was homogeneous on their responses towards Crisis Management based on the level of crisis experienced. While on the Sex comparison, it was found a significant difference result on the sublimation Crisis Management, with an alpha value less than 0.05, an indication that male and female agreement on sublimation was different in each other. The result of no significant difference was also obtained in comparing more two independent groups of age and highest educational attainment. The result implies the homogeneity of the responses as to the Crisis Management of the respondents based on the crisis level experienced by the different profile variable sub-group but significant difference was found in the agreement of respondents in terms of length of service as to the introjection Crisis Management. This implies a heterogeneous response of the respondent length of service.

Table 8. The significant difference test on the Crisis Management by CCJE students as grouped according to profile.

| Crisis Management | Sex | | | Boarding Status | | | Scholarship | | | Age | | |
|-------------------|---------|---------|-----|-----------------|---------|----|-------------|---------|----|---------|---------|----|
| | Tabular | p-value | i | Tabular | p-value | i | Tabular | p-value | i | Tabular | p-value | i |
| Sublimation | -2.05 | 0.04 | Sig | -0.97 | 0.33 | NS | -0.33 | 0.74 | NS | 2.87 | 0.24 | NS |
| Regression | -1.25 | 0.21 | NS | -0.2 | 0.84 | NS | -1.3 | 0.19 | NS | 0.86 | 0.65 | NS |
| Projection | -0.37 | 0.71 | NS | -1.28 | 0.2 | NS | -0.57 | 0.57 | NS | 4.91 | 0.09 | NS |
| Introjection | -0.3 | 0.76 | NS | -0.23 | 0.82 | NS | -1.31 | 0.19 | NS | 0.15 | 0.93 | NS |
| Displacement | -0.29 | 0.77 | NS | -0.31 | 0.75 | NS | -0.39 | 0.7 | NS | 1.05 | 0.59 | NS |

The relationship between crisis level and Crisis Management

Table 9 shows the results of the correlational analysis between the crisis level and the Crisis Management of the CCJE students. Based on the result of the correlational analysis employed between the level of crisis experienced and the Crisis Management of CCJE students in district five, it shows that no significant relationship between the level of environmental crisis and the five Crisis Management stated. On the organizational crisis, introjection Crisis Management was highly significant correlated at 0.439 as alpha value was less than 0.01, while the correlation of projection at 0.364, regression (0.317) and displacement (0.314) was significant at alpha less than 0.05 but greater than 0.01. The positive significant correlation results imply that as the level of organizational crisis experienced by the respondents increases the more they engage in introjection, projection, regression and displacement Crisis Management. On the personal crisis, the projection and introjection Crisis Management was positively correlated at 0.362 and 0.318 as alpha value was less than 0.05. The positive correlation results between the two variables implies that as the level of personal crisis increases the more the respondents will engage to projection and introjection Crisis Management.

Table 9. The relationship between Crisis level and Crisis Management

| | | Sublimation | Regression | Projection | Introjection | Displacement |
|---------------------------|---------|-------------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|
| 1. Environmental factor | r-value | .128 | -.087 | .157 | .270 | -.019 |
| | p-value | .426 | .589 | .326 | .088 | .907 |
| | result | Not Sig | Not Sig | Not Sig | Not Sig | Not Sig |
| 2. Organizational Factors | r-value | .225 | .317* | .364* | .439** | .314* |
| | p-value | .157 | .043 | .019 | .004 | .045 |
| | result | Not Sig | Sig | Sig | H-Sig | Sig |
| 3. Personal Factors | r-value | .148 | .075 | .362* | .318* | .222 |
| | p-value | .355 | .640 | .020 | .043 | .162 |
| | result | Not Sig | Not Sig | Sig | Sig | Not Sig |

CONCLUSION

From the derived results and findings of the study, the following conclusion has been formulated.

The CCJE students of Guimaras State College was experiencing a moderate level of stress in both environmental and organizational stressors while a low to moderate stress level for personal stressor has been experienced but the disagreement of the majority has been identified for mean stress level values of organizational and personal stressors while their positive agreement was observed in environmental stressor. A no significant difference was found for every the profile variable sub-group. Coping mechanisms were strategies of the individual in order to cope-up or relieve from the experienced stress from different sources. The administrator was not directly stated the agreement if sublimation mechanism as applicable for the three stressors as their response was undecided but noticeably it could be applicable for experiencing organizational stress. For the introjection coping mechanism, the overall response of administrators was undecided to apply this type of coping in the three identified stressors but still considerable as their coping mechanism as it was positively agreed by the majority. Regression, projection, and displacement coping mechanisms were disagreed by the respondents for its applicability to cope up stress from the identified stressors. A significant difference result on the sublimation coping mechanism was found for male and female, and significant difference in introjection in terms of length of service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the formulated conclusions of the study, the following were recommended:

1. Commission on Higher Education should provide valuable information on the relevance of school crisis, therefore policy initiatives of the Higher Education must be delivered. Crisis in study place as a worldwide issue, the department could have a relevant information on how to address the problem and eventually improve the ineffective education systems in order to address the matter of administrators' stress and burnout in secondary schools.
2. The Educational Planners would be more aware of their roles in formulating policies for the enhancement of school supervision programs. This will be a gauge for local and national planners for education in realizing the necessity of restructuring policies and guidelines in school management and planning for the benefit of students. They should improve their formulated programs presently implemented in the department. This could be vital to the planners not to be confined only to their functions but to constantly re-invent their roles either by doing something new or venturing into areas that are not traditionally done by them.
3. The Dean should understand how the school crisis affects the overall performance of students while in school and a necessary and appropriate intervention can be forwarded in lessen the crisis that causes the burden of the students. Initiatives can also be formulated that would help enhance the crisis management styles of the students in dealing with school related pressures.
4. Hence the respondents are the most important element of the study, therefore they should assess themselves after knowing how crisis and crisis management they adopt affects their performance in managing their respective school's responsibility. With this study, they will be able to evaluate their personal relationship with their environment and with the organization as well. This study would develop their capacities by knowing their potential on how to cope with threatening situations at work and at home.
5. The Classroom Teachers. This study is significant to the teachers who are closely working with their school administrators. Through this study, they will be able to determine how stress affects their teaching profession. Furthermore, the study will guide them on how to deal with job-related problems they encounter every day. The information derived from this study will prepare them to take the challenge of being future administrators.
6. Further study can be conducted using some other factors or crisis that the students may be experiencing in school and other crisis management can be applied.

REFERENCES

A. BOOKS

- Chaplin, J.P.(1985).
Dictionary of Psychology, Dell Publishing Group Inc. USA.
- Covey, Stephen R. (2013).
The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People.25th Anniversary Edition, Simon and Schuster Inc., New York.
- Judge, Timothy A., and Robins, Stephen P. (2011)
Organizational Behavior. 14thed.,Pearson Education Inc.
- Leveriza, Jose P. (2010).
Public Administration: The Business of Government. Manila, 2nd ed., National Bookstore.
- Maxwell, John C. (2003).
Relationship 101. Thomas Nelson Inc. Tennessee, USA.
- Omas-as, Roberta L. (2005).
You and Your Personality. Quezon City: Great Books Publishing.
- Pegues, Deborah S. (2012).
Taming your Crisis. Oregon, U.S.A.: Harvest House Publishers.
- Sala, Harold J. (2013).
Boredom, Crisis, and Burnout. Manila: OMF Literature, Inc.
Webster Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the English Language, Lexicon Publication Inc., USA 2000.

B. JOURNALS/REPORTS

- International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education Development, 2012.
Magallanes, Luciano T.,(2013). Manual of Social Science Research.
NSO Instructional Manual, 1993.

C. PUBLISHED/UNPUBLISHED RESEARCH

- Caniete, T. et.al.,(2007).
Crisis Experience and Coping Mechanism utilized by Third Years Student of Colegio San Agustin-Bacolod.
- Ngari, S.M. et.al.,(2011).
Level of CrisisamongSchoolStudents and its Implication in Education Management in Kenya.
- Rintaugu, E. G.,(2013).
Socio-Demographic Factors and Causes of Job Crisis of Sports Personnel in Kenyan Universities.
- Rosales, J.S.,(1999).
Level of Crisis Experienced by Personnel of the Philippine National Police in the Ten Cities in the Province of Negros Occidental: Baseline Data for an Effective Crisis Management Program.
- Sanchez, N.Y.,(2009).
Occupational Crisis and Self Efficacy Experienced by Medical-Surgical Nurses in Selected Affiliated Hospitals of Colegio San Agustin-Bacolod.
- Segal, R. and Smith M.,(2014). Crisis Management.
- Yambo, J.M.O. et.al.,(2012).
Investigating High School Principals' Crisis in Relation to their Job Experience in School in Southern Nyanza Region of Kenya