



**RISK-BASED APPROACHES AND ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE OF
DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY REGION IV-A:
BASIS FOR ACTION PLAN**

ESPERANZA C. TUMBAGA
Master in Business Administration Student

Laguna College of Business and Arts
0968-856-0867
tumbagaesperanza@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The business world is constantly changing, and industries are undoubtedly thriving in a volatile, unpredictable, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environment. In 2020 alone, the world has changed dramatically, and the problems that businesses face are ever-changing.

With this, the study was conducted to assess the impact of risk-based approaches namely: risk identification, risk analysis, risk response, risk control, and risk monitoring on the level of manifestation of organizational resilience in terms of leadership and culture, network, and relationships and change-readiness.

The responses were gathered through an online survey administered to all employees of DTI IV-A from the Regional and Provincial Offices and were analyzed using mean and linear regression analysis. Based on the general assessments, the level of implementation on risk-based approaches was interpreted as Implemented to Fully Implemented while the level of manifestation of organizational resilience were interpreted as Manifested. The results also showed that there was a significant relationship between the implementation of risk-based approaches and the manifestation of organizational resilience. Moreover, it proved that risk-based approaches singly and in combination significantly impact organizational resilience of DTI IV-A which implied that the higher the level of the risk-based approaches implementation, the higher the manifestation of organizational resilience and vice versa.

These results then suggested that DTI IV-A needed to strengthen risk-based management practices or approaches to sustain organizational resilience by promoting collaboration and engagement between the management, employees, and key stakeholders. On this basis, an action plan that outlined the actions needed to achieve those objectives was crafted.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Keywords: risk; resilience; risk-based; organizational resilience

INTRODUCTION

It is not surprising that organizations face internal and external factors and influences that make it difficult to predict whether, when, and to what extent they will achieve or exceed their goals and objectives. The effect this uncertainty has on the organization's objectives is "risk". Anything that threatens and or hampers an organization's ability to achieve its financial goals or deliver its mandate is considered a business risk. In today's volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) business climate, organizations are exposed to greater risks.

Thomson Financial Corporate Services (2017) pertained to an information provider and an arm of the Thomson Corporation, with major offices located across the US, Europe, and Asia Pacific regions, cited in its' Risk Management and Business Continuity Planning Report some sobering statistics including the report of the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics that "40% of all businesses who experienced a disaster never open again and roughly 25% of the remaining companies close within two years". Additionally, if the United States were to experience an avian flu pandemic, a Sun Microsystems white paper presumes that as much as "30 to 50 percent of the workforce may get sick or be absent from work." Therefore, these statistics suggested that companies' failure to continue to address and plan for the "what ifs" could result in a disastrous outcome for employees, shareholders and consumers.

Meanwhile, according to the Global Risks Report of the World Economic Forum (2016), the top 10 risks for doing business in the Philippines were extreme weather events, natural catastrophes, failure of critical infrastructure, energy price shock, failure of national governance, failure of urban planning, unemployment or underemployment, failure of climate-change mitigation and adaptation, terrorist attacks and unmanageable inflation.

Indeed, doing business in the Philippines is getting even more complex and uncertain as it is, the reason why more business owners, leaders, and decision-makers are already recognizing the need for risk management and striving for resilience.

The CALABARZON region has the second-highest population density in the country which includes the provinces of Cavite, Laguna, Batangas, Rizal, and Quezon, and a home to 14.4 million Filipinos with thriving industries such as semi-processed industrial raw materials and industrial components generated from its 31 world-class industrial estates and economic zones. In 2020

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



alone, it faced various business challenges due to catastrophic occurrences. On January 12, 2020, the Taal Volcano erupted, 43 years after its previous eruption in 1977.

Following this, the President put the entire Region IV-A region under a state of calamity due to the disruption in many aspects of social life, from maintaining livelihoods to using infrastructures to securing the public. On March 7, 2020, CALABARZON become involved in the worldwide pandemic of coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) when the first case was confirmed in Rizal. Yearly, the onset of numerous typhoons also results in several casualties with more than a hundred of thousand residents displaced. To positively respond to disruptions, cope in spite of adversity, optimizing opportunities and bringing long-term performance improvement, the Department of Trade and Industry IV-A, a national government agency in charge of achieving the Philippines' goal of having globally competitive and innovative industry and service sectors that contribute to inclusive growth and job generation has incorporated Risk-Based Thinking in its Quality Management System (QMS). It is a systematic approach to risk which guarantees that these risks are identified, considered and controlled throughout the design and implementation of the QMS. Additionally, this process allows people in the organization to identify, assess, respond, control and monitor risks in order to cope with volatility and stresses.

On the other hand, another important aspect that was given due emphasis during these challenging times for businesses is resilience. In an organizational context, Denyer (2017) described resilience as "the ability of an organization to anticipate, prepare for, respond and adapt to incremental change and sudden disruptions in order to survive and prosper". A resilient organization is one that thrives over time rather than just responding to every crisis or recovering from a setback. It is an overall transformation as to how an organization operates and flourishes – ready for the future.

Because the business world is now recognizing the need to run organizations in taking measured risks rather than "waiting out a storm" therefore mastering organizational resilience, and in reference to the Organizational Resilience Report of the British Standards Institutes by Denyer (2017) that there was currently a focus on defensive behaviors with insufficient emphasis on resilience to quickly adapt to new circumstances and deal with the complex and significant issues that affect modern businesses, the purpose of this study is to assess the impact of risk-based approaches on organizational resilience in DTI IV-A.

Specifically, the researcher aimed to find out and determine the effect of the level of implementation of the risk assessment processes namely: risk identification, risk analysis, risk response, risk control, and risk monitoring on the level of manifestation of organizational resilience in terms of leadership and culture, network and relationships and change-readiness. This applied,

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



in particular, to the top-level management down to the rank-and-file employees. The findings, conclusion, and recommendations served as bases for crafting an action plan which was expected to be beneficial to the management, employees, and stakeholders in the long run.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this study, the researcher employed a quantitative approach and made use of the descriptive-correlational research design.

According to Creswell (2002, as cited in Mustieles, 2020), descriptive correlational method referred to a type of study in which information was collected without making any changes to the study subject. Moreover, the researcher was primarily interested in describing relationships between variables rather than attempting to establish a causal relationship. This would be used to determine the impact of the level of implementation on risk-based approaches (independent variable) on the level of manifestation of organizational resilience (dependent variable) leading to results that served as basis in the formulation of an action plan. The data were gathered from the employees of DTI IV-A Regional and Provincial Offices. The accessibility of the respondents was also the top consideration of the researcher.

This study used the simple random sampling as the sampling method. Hayes (2021) described simple random sampling as the randomized selection of a small segment of individuals or members from a whole population. It ensured that each individual or member of a population had an equal and fair chance of being selected. The DTI IV-A had a current total personnel complement of one hundred twenty (120) employees. To determine the sample size, the Raosoft application was used to calculate the number of respondents at 95% level of confidence and 5% margin of error.

The respondents of the study were the employees of DTI IV-A Regional and Provincial Offices excluding the officials occupying the third-level positions. The respondents were chosen regardless of age, gender, marital status and nature of appointment.

The researcher utilized the self-made survey questionnaire as an instrument of the study. The questionnaire was disseminated to the employees of DTI IV-A Regional and Provincial Offices via email and answered were retrieved through Google forms. The following indicators were used to describe the level of implementation on risk-based approaches using the four-point Likert scale:

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Scale	Range Value	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Fully Implemented
3	2.50 – 3.24	Implemented
2	1.75 – 2.49	Partially Implemented
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Implemented

The following indicators were used to describe the level of manifestation of organizational resilience using the four-point Likert scale:

Scale	Range Value	Verbal Interpretation
4	3.25 – 4.00	Fully Manifested
3	2.50 – 3.24	Manifested
2	1.75 – 2.49	Partially Manifested
1	1.00 – 1.74	Not Manifested

To obtain relevant information in most reliable and valid manner, the survey questionnaire as the instrument of the study was presented to the adviser and experts for validation. The survey questionnaire consisted of seven (7) statements under each indicator taken from the theoretical framework. Three (3) experts validated the set of questions to determine the appropriateness, relevance and consistency of the instrument. The result of 0.98 CVI using the Content Validity Index (CVI) and Cronbach's Alpha Reliability test score of .80 - .96 proved that all items were reliable. The same was used to gather data on the level of implementation on risk-based approaches and level of manifestation of organizational resilience in DTI IV-A.

In order to gather responses, the researcher sent a letter of request addressed to the Regional Director to seek clearance/approval before the dissemination of survey questionnaires to the respondents. Upon approval, the survey questionnaires were disseminated via email and answers were retrieved through Google Forms. Finally, data collected, tallied and analyzed were interpreted by the researcher.

As the study required the participation of employees as the source of data, the researcher informed the respondents of the purpose of the study, sought their full consent and made them aware who would have access to the findings. As to the confidentiality, the DTI IV-A employees were given the right to remain anonymous to ensure that identifying information will be excluded from any report or published documents.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



The following are the statistical treatments applied to the study:

1. The mean and the four-point Likert scale were used to describe the level of implementation on risk-based approaches.
2. The mean and the four-point Likert scale were used to describe the level of manifestation of organizational resilience.
3. The Pearson Product Moment Coefficient Correlation (Pearson r) was used to measure the relationship between the level of implementation on risk-based approaches and the level of manifestation of organizational resilience in DTI IV-A.
4. To determine the impact between the level of implementation on risk-based approaches and level of manifestation of organizational resilience, the linear regression analysis was used.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Discussion per problem and per table/thematic chart followed by discussion, interpretation/reflection, and supporting literature.

Table 1.1

Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Identification

Indicators in terms of Risk Identification In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. There is a standard practice of documentation review to identify project-related risks.	3.34	FI
2. Strengths, Opportunities, Weaknesses, and Threats are identified thus, risks are determined.	3.43	FI
3. Brainstorming is done by a group of people who focus on identification of risks.	3.33	FI
4. Interviews are conducted with stakeholders and experts to identify risks.	2.91	I
5. A Client Satisfaction Survey is administered regularly to seek feedbacks including potential risks	3.62	FI
6. Root causes are determined for the identified risks through a Root Cause Analysis	3.20	I
7. Identified risks are reflected in a Risk Register.	3.48	FI
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	3.33	FI

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI)
2.50 – 3.24 Implemented (I)

1.75 – 2.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.74 Not Implemented (NV)

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 1.1 shows the Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Identification.

The general assessment was 3.33 which was interpreted as Fully Implemented in DTI IV-A. In addition, the indicator "A Client Satisfaction Survey is administered regularly to seek feedbacks including potential risks" had the highest computed mean of 3.62 which was verbally interpreted as Fully Implemented, while the indicator "Interviews are conducted with stakeholders and experts to identify risks" had the lowest computed mean of 2.91 and was verbally interpreted as Implemented.

The above-mentioned findings of the study imply that systematic risk identification practices are already in place. Feedbacks from clients of DTI IV-A are given due importance not only to determine what needs to be improved but is also used as a source to identify potentials risks. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating "Interviews are conducted with stakeholders and experts to identify risks". It depicts that external stakeholder are not fully engaged during the risk identification phase to assure that there are no risks overlooked in all aspects.

As cited in Webb (2021), everyone, from frontline employees to the CEO, will have a unique perspective on the organization and the risks they face while performing their duties. Employees are thus one of the most valuable resources for identifying risks. All employees, particularly key stakeholders, may have some insight into risks encountered in day-to-day business practices that you would not have considered otherwise. Feedback can be obtained anonymously, one-on-one, or in a group setting. Allowing anonymous incident reporting may increase the likelihood of response from employees who are afraid of repercussions for speaking up, whereas group discussions may increase brainstorming and result in a greater number of identified risks.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 1.2
Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Analysis

Indicators in terms of Risk Analysis In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. Identified risks are analyzed to understand how much uncertainty surrounds each one.	3.31	FI
2. The probability and impact of uncertainty is determined through a Risk Assessment Matrix.	3.26	FI
3. The extent to which individual employees, stakeholders, functions, and services that might be harmed or affected by potential risks are studied.	2.99	I
4. Project outcomes and objectives that might change due to the impact of the risk event are examined.	3.03	I
5. There is a consultation with risk experts to analyze potential threats and vulnerabilities to the organization.	2.81	I
6. The Structured What If Technique or SWIFT Analysis is used to understand the consequence and viability of all risks based on different changes made to any aspect of a project/s.	2.45	PI
7. Causes and consequences are listed to understand the risks reasonably, called as Bow-Tie Analysis.	2.59	I
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	2.92	I

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 1.75 – 2.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
2.50 – 3.24 Implemented (I) 1.00 – 1.74 Not Implemented (NV)

Table 1.2 illustrates the Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Analysis. The general assessment was 2.92 which meant that risk-based approaches in terms of risk analysis was Implemented in DTI IV-A. In addition, the indicator “Identified risks are analyzed to understand how much uncertainty surrounds each one” had the highest computed mean of 3.31 which was verbally interpreted as Fully Implemented while the indicator “The Structured What If Technique or SWIFT Analysis is used to understand the consequence and viability of all risks based on different changes made to any aspect of a project/s” had the lowest computed mean of 2.45 and was verbally interpreted as Partially Implemented.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



This deduced that risks identified are carefully examined and equally assessed through a matrix to reveal the probability of occurrence, and if there are underlying uncertainties that are associated with them. All interested parties and their relevant roles are also taken into consideration. This is important in order to determine the risk treatment for each risk identified. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating “The Structured What If Technique or SWIFT Analysis is used to understand the consequence and viability of all risks based on different changes made to any aspect of a project/s”. It depicts that the organization is yet to fully adopt a systematic analysis to be conducted regularly to come up with reliable risk assessment outcomes specifically designed for unique programs and projects.

Rosencrance (2021) stated that risk analysis is the process of identifying and analyzing potential issues that could negatively impact key business initiatives or projects. This procedure is carried out to assist organizations in avoiding or mitigating risks. A risk analysis includes considering the possibility of adverse events caused by natural processes such as severe storms, earthquakes, or floods, as well as adverse events caused by malicious or inadvertent human activity. Identifying the potential for harm from these events, as well as the likelihood that they will occur, is an important part of risk analysis.

Table 1.3
Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risks Response

Indicators in terms of Risk Response In DTI IV-A...	\bar{x}	VI
1. There is a Avoid Risk Response Strategy to eliminate causes of the threat.	2.76	I
2. There is a Mitigate Risk Response Strategy to reduce the impact or the probability of a threat.	2.89	I
3. There is a Transfer Risk Response Strategy to involve/ find another party who is willing to take responsibility for the management of risks.	2.44	PI
4. There is an Actively Accept Risk Response Strategy to develop a (contingency) plan and make reserves for a risk if and when it happens.	2.76	I
5. There is a Passively Accept Risk Response Strategy to decide if there is a workaround when a risk happens, or to simply soak up the impact.	2.61	I
6. There is a Escalate Risk Response Strategy to get engagement from a stakeholder who can eliminate or mitigate risk.	2.53	I

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



7. Risk responses are timely and realistic within the project context and agreed upon by all parties involved.	2.94	I
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	2.70	I

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 1.75 – 2.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
2.50 – 3.24 Implemented (I) 1.00 – 1.74 Not Implemented (NV)

Table 1.3 presented the Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Response. The general assessment was 2.70 which led that risk-based approaches in terms of risk response was Implemented in DTI IV-A. In addition, the indicator "Risk responses are timely and realistic within the project context and agreed upon by all parties involved" had the highest computed mean of 2.94 which was verbally interpreted as Implemented, while the indicator "There is a Transfer Risk Response Strategy to involve/ find another party who is willing to take responsibility for the management of risks." had the lowest computed mean of 2.44 and was verbally interpreted as Partially Implemented.

This inferred that risk response strategies are planned, studied, discussed and are agreed upon by all parties involved. Likewise, it is ensured that these responses are doable and that catch-up actions can be done within the intended timeline. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating "There is a Transfer Risk Response Strategy to involve/ find another party who is willing to take responsibility for the management of risks" It depicts that the organization has not established stronger connection yet to reliable parties that will assume identified risks if and when it happens.

According to Greycampus (2021), the risk response planning involves determining ways to reduce or eliminate any threats to the project, and also the opportunities to increase their impact. Project managers should work to prevent threats from occurring. Likewise, project managers should work to ensure that opportunities arise. Similarly, the project manager is responsible for reducing the likelihood and impact of threats while increasing the likelihood and impact of opportunities. Project managers must have solid contingency plans in place for hazards that cannot be mitigated, as well as response plans in case the contingencies fail. It is not necessary to eliminate all project risk due to budget and time constraints. Throughout the project, a project manager should keep an eye on risk. Risk management is an iterative process.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 1.4

Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risks Control

Indicators in terms of Risk Control In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. The work environment is organized in a way that risks are considered and prioritized.	3.20	I
2. Risks are eliminated by trying a no to less-risky option.	2.96	I
3. Risks are substituted by considering less hazardous or lower risk material, equipment, or process available.	3.01	I
4. There is always increased awareness within the organization of the scheduled terms of risks and discussed plans are implemented to treat risk.	2.99	I
5. Potential losses are evaluated and actions are taken to reduce or eliminate risks.	2.91	I
6. Risks are foreseen and preplanning is encouraged to keep them in control.	3.17	I
7. A lesson learned register that contains strategies, approaches, and methods to address critical risks is maintained and revisited.	2.89	I
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	3.02	I

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 1.75 – 2.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
2.50 – 3.24 Implemented (I) 1.00 – 1.74 Not Implemented (NV)

Table 1.4 shows the Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Control. The general assessment was 3.02 which meant that risk-based approaches in terms of risk control was Implemented in DTI IV-A. In addition, the indicator “The work environment is organized in a way that risks are considered and prioritized” had the highest computed mean of 3.20 which was verbally interpreted as Implemented, while the indicator “A lesson learned register that contains strategies, approaches, and methods to address critical risks is maintained and revisited” had the lowest computed mean of 2.89 and was verbally interpreted as Implemented.

This suggests that after due implementation of risk responses, controls are institutionalized by providing a safe space for employees and clients. In addition, because risks are identified, analyzed and responded accordingly, proactive measures are set to mitigate and or keep them in control. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to DTI

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



IV-A employees is the indicator stating "A lesson learned register that contains strategies, approaches, and methods to address critical risks is maintained and revisited". It depicts that the organization is encountering challenges in maintaining a systematic record/inventory of what have been accomplished.

As stated in Kenton (2021), risk control is the set of methods by which firms evaluate potential losses and take action to reduce or eliminate such threats. It is a technique that makes use of risk assessment findings that involve identifying potential risk factors in a firm's activities, such as technical and non-technical aspects of the business, financial policies, and other issues that may affect the firm's well-being. Risk management also involves the implementation of proactive changes to reduce risk in these areas. As a result, risk management assists businesses in limiting the loss of assets and income. Risk management is an important part of an organization's enterprise risk management (ERM) protocol.

Additionally, Aaron (2018) expressed that risk control measures are a crucial tool to aid in the prevention of accident or injury in the workplace. They should be part of the company's larger health and safety plan, providing a method for identifying, controlling, and reducing workplace risks.

Table 1.5
Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Monitoring

Indicators in terms of Risks Monitoring In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. Reassessment exercises for the updating of risk registers by teams are conducted at regular intervals.	2.88	I
2. Risk audits are conducted to examine the effectiveness of the risk responses and to determine whether changes are required.	3.09	I
3. Process owners report to a risk monitoring team periodically to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan, any unanticipated effects, and any mid-course correction needed to mitigate the risk.	2.75	I
4. Further preventive actions are planned in case a trend of new risk is identified or uncertainties increased.	2.87	I

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



5. Contingency and management reserves are added to the Work and Financial Plan to ensure adequacy when risks occur.	2.74	I
6. A risk management plan is in place to guide employees on how to deal with and manage risks.	2.99	I
7. Stakeholders are kept in the loop on the risk status.	2.80	I
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		2.88
GENERAL ASSESSMENT		I

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Fully Implemented (FI) 1.75 – 2.49 Partially Implemented (PI)
2.50 – 3.24 Implemented (I) 1.00 – 1.74 Not Implemented (NV)

Table 1.5 presents the Level of Implementation of Risk-based Approaches in DTI IV-A in terms of Risk Monitoring. The general assessment was 2.88 and with this, risk-based approaches in terms of risk monitoring was Implemented in DTI IV-A. In addition, the indicator “Risk audits are conducted to examine the effectiveness of the risk responses and to determine whether changes are required” attained the highest computed mean of 3.09, which was verbally interpreted as Implemented, while the indicator “Contingency and management reserves are added to the Work and Financial Plan to ensure adequacy when risks occur” had the lowest computed mean of 2.74 and was verbally interpreted as Implemented.

This implies that risk responses are re-assessed to determine its usefulness and accuracy in present conditions and whether or not there is a need to calibrate those responses. Moreover, risk audits are conducted by composite teams and results are analyzed and evaluated to identify room for improvement. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating “Contingency and management reserves are added to the Work and Financial Plan to ensure adequacy when risks occur.” This depicts that there are gaps in contingency planning which shall be prioritized for inclusion in the Work and Financial Plan.

According to Skillmaker (2019), risk monitoring is the process which tracks and evaluates the levels of risk in an organization. The discipline tracks and evaluates the effectiveness of the risk management strategies in addition to monitoring the risk itself. The results of risk monitoring processes is used to help develop new strategies and update older strategies that have proven ineffective. The goal of risk monitoring is to keep track of the risks that occur as well as the effectiveness of the responses that an organization implements. Monitoring can help determine

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



whether proper policies were followed, whether new risks have been identified, and whether previous risk assumptions remain valid. Because risk is not constant, it is critical to monitor it.

Table 2.1

Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Leadership and Culture

Indicators in terms of Leadership and Culture In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. Continuous evaluation of strategies and work programs vis-à-vis organizational goals promotes strong crisis leadership that provides good management and effective decision making.	3.16	M
2. Employees are empowered to use their skills to solve problems.	3.33	FM
3. Employees are recognized for utilizing innovative and creative approaches to problem-solving.	3.20	M
4. Employees are commended for sharing both positive and negative news about the organization including early warning signals, which are immediately reported to management.	3.03	M
5. Authority is delegated and employees are allowed to make decisions in times of emergency response	3.08	M
6. Employees are aware of the link between their jobs, the organization's resiliency, and its long-term success.	3.22	M
7. Employees are interested in, or capable of making, decisions where their specific knowledge provides substantial value or where their involvement can aid implementation.	3.18	M
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	3.17	M

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Fully Manifested (FM)
 1.75 – 2.49 Partially Manifested (PM)
 2.50 – 3.24 Manifested (M)
 1.00 – 1.74 Not Manifested (NM)

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
 Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
 Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 2.1 shows the Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Leadership and Culture. The general assessment was 3.17 and with that, organizational resilience in terms of leadership and culture was Manifested by the DTI IV-A employees. In addition, the indicator "Employees are empowered to use their skills to solve problems" had the highest computed mean of 3.33 which was verbally interpreted as Highly Manifested, while the indicator "Employees are commended for sharing both positive and negative news about the organization including early warning signals, which are immediately reported to management" had the lowest computed mean of 3.03 and was verbally interpreted as Manifested.

This implies that employees have the capacity to handle issues and concerns and are able to utilize their skills in problem-solving. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to the DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating "Employees are commended for sharing both positive and negative news about the organization including early warning signals, which are immediately reported to management." It depicts that there has been gaps in rewards and recognition programs design in relation to employee involvement on risk-based practices.

Suarez and Montes (2020) revealed that organizations frequently ask employees to specialize in specific tasks or activities. It was quick and easy to implement, and it works well with pre-scripted organizational procedures. In uncertain times, however, a group's resilience is enhanced by a broader understanding of how other areas work (possibly gained through cross-training). Team members have a better understanding of how their work affects the work of others, and vice versa. As a result, when a routine is altered, the work of the wider group is less likely to be disrupted.

Furthermore, according to Organisational Resilience (2016), a culture and set of values where people welcome and seek to introduce change and innovation, where leaders care for their employees and foster collaboration, and where there is an ambition to deliver results and a focus on achieving goals has a significant and positive effect on organizational performance.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 2.2

Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Network & Relationships

Indicators in terms of Network & Relationships In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. Employees understand the relationships and support that the organization might need to access in the event of an emergency.	3.17	M
2. When planning, the possibility of something can go wrong is prioritized and management ensures access to immediate support in case of an emergency.	3.03	M
3. Critical information is stored in numerous formats and locations.	3.05	M
4. Responsibilities are shared and employees are trained so that someone is always available to fill key roles/positions.	3.28	HM
5. Social, cultural, and behavioral barriers are minimized so as not to hinder effective communication	3.18	M
6. There is open communication with internal and external stakeholders about change.	3.13	M
7. There is a cohesive culture of quality, responsibility and service.	3.22	M
GENERAL ASSESSMENT	3.15	M

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Highly Manifested (HM)
1.75 – 2.49 Slightly Manifested (SM)
2.50 – 3.24 Manifested (M)
1.00 – 1.74 Not Manifested (NM)

Table 2.2 illustrates the Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Network & Relationships. The general assessment was 3.15 and with that, organizational resilience in terms of network and relationship was Manifested by the DTI IV-A employees. In addition, the indicator “Responsibilities are shared and employees are trained so that someone is always available to fill key roles/positions” had the highest computed mean of 3.28 which was verbally interpreted as Highly Manifested, while the indicator “When planning, the possibility of something can go wrong is prioritized and management ensures access to immediate support in case of an emergency” had the lowest computed mean of 3.03 and was verbally interpreted as Manifested.

This implies that the organization was able to established harmonious relationships with networks and partners. The staffing plan is designed to anticipate emergency such as insufficiency in manpower so that someone would be ready to assume important functions, and organizational

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



communication is given due importance. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to the DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating “When planning, the possibility of something can go wrong is prioritized and management ensures access to immediate support in case of an emergency”. This depicts that the organization is encountering challenges in contingency planning specifically, the involvement of other parties in times of emergency response.

Organisational Resilience (2016) stated that networks and relationships attribute describe ‘the internal and external relationships fostered and developed for the organization to leverage when needed’. It is the understanding of those relationships and resources an organization might need to access from other organizations during times of adversity, and necessary preparatory planning and ongoing management to ensure this access.

Moreover, Lucy and Shepherd (2018) reiterated that a wide network of collaborative relationships and partnerships enables better problem solving, more fluid sharing of ideas, as well as making available practical support and resources. Connections are needed outside the organization to both help with sensing how the environment is changing, as a potential wellspring of ideas, and also as a source of support when times are difficult.

Table 2.3
Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Change-Readiness

Indicators in terms of Change-Readiness In DTI IV-A...	\bar{X}	VI
1. Management and employees understand that change is necessary for continuous improvement and success and are aware of the organizations' priorities following an emergency.	3.25	HM
2. Plans and strategies are developed to address vulnerabilities in the business environment and its stakeholders.	3.19	M
3. Employees participate in simulations or scenarios designed to practice response arrangements.	2.99	M
4. Decisions concerning change are made quickly and change objectives, impacts, and outcomes are communicated clearly.	2.98	M
5. Employees know and understand the organization's minimum operating requirements when faced with an emergency.	3.15	M
6. Early warning signals in the internal and external environments are identified and people exhibit strategic and behavioral readiness to change.	2.96	M
7. Management and employees validate emergency response plans.	2.97	M

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



GENERAL ASSESSMENT

3.07

M

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Highly Manifested (HM)
1.75 – 2.49 Slightly Manifested (SM)
2.50 – 3.24 Manifested (M)
1.00 – 1.74 Not Manifested (NM)

Table 2.3 shows the Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Change-Readiness. The general assessment was 3.07, accordingly, the organizational resilience in terms of change-readiness was Manifested by the DTI IV-A employees. In addition, the indicator “Management and employees understand that change is necessary for continuous improvement and success and are aware of the organizations' priorities following an emergency” obtained the highest computed mean of 3.25, which was verbally interpreted as Highly Manifested while the indicator “Early warning signals in the internal and external environments are identified and people exhibit strategic and behavioral readiness to change” had the lowest computed mean of 2.96 and was verbally interpreted as Manifested.

This implies that people within the organization discuss and understands that change is inevitable. When faced with challenges and emergency, employees are engaged in coming up with solutions and response plans. Likewise, change is recognized as a prerequisite for continuous improvement. However, the indicator that has the lowest assessment according to the DTI IV-A employees is the indicator stating “Early warning signals in the internal and external environments are identified and people exhibit strategic and behavioral readiness to change.” This depicts that the organization is encountering challenges in conducting regular environmental scanning to fully realize the extent and importance of change.

According to Stoltz (2000), as cited in Carvalho (2016), change itself is no longer a source of competitive advantage, according to Stoltz (2000). True competitive advantage is determined by the speed, magnitude, and direction with which an organization can change. Speeding up the change cycle is entirely dependent on the readiness of the participants. “If the people aren’t on board, no amount of speeches and meetings can change a thing”.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan
Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista
Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 3

Test of Significant Relationship between the Level of Implementation on Risk-based Approaches and the Level of Manifestation of Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A

Risk-based Approaches	Organizational Resilience	r value	P value	Decision	Remarks
Risk identification	Leadership and Culture	.706**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Network & Relationships	.674**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Change-Readiness	.671**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
Risk analysis	Leadership and Culture	.693**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Network & Relationships	.694**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Change-Readiness	.725**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
Risk response	Leadership and Culture	.581**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Network & Relationships	.615**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Change-Readiness	.575**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
Risk control	Leadership and Culture	.754**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Network & Relationships	.732**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Change-Readiness	.729**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
Risk monitoring	Leadership and Culture	.725**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Network & Relationships	.709**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant
	Change-Readiness	.707**	.000	Reject H ₀	Significant

**Correlational at the level 0.01

*Correlational at the level 0.05(Two-tailed)

As shown in table 3, the r values of all the variables were interpreted as with moderate positive to high positive correlation as to correlate Risk-based Approaches and Organizational Resilience, and the computed probability values were lesser than the level of significant ($P < 0.05$); thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The result shown that there is significant relationship between the level of implementation on risk-based approaches on the level of manifestation of organizational resilience.

It can be concluded that the Risk-based Approaches has high significant relationship with Organizational Resilience. The higher the level of the Risk-based Approaches Implementation, the higher the manifestation of Organizational Resilience and vice versa.

Kunkel (2021) revealed that organizational resilience starts at the top with an enterprise risk management (ERM) strategy -- a plan-based business strategy that aims to identify, assess, and

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



prepare for any dangers, hazards, and other potentials for disaster — both physical and figurative — that may interfere with an organization's operations and objectives.” In other words, It was the collection of efforts to manage risks to people, projects and profits. Having an ERM strategy in place allows a business to stay one step ahead of the risks that threaten its operations now and in the future. This is a crucial part of becoming resilient because the goal in times of adversity is to sustain business operations.

Table 4.1
Regression Analysis on the Impact of the Risk-based Approaches to Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A terms of Leadership and Culture

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Decision	Remarks
	B	Beta	Beta				
(Constant)	.177	.265		.666	.507		
Risk identification	.359	.124	.283	2.884	.005	Significant	Reject H ₀
Risk analysis	.043	.149	.040	.288	.774	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
Risk response	-.166	.107	-.180	-1.552	.124	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
Risk control	.390	.141	.369	2.776	.007	Significant	Reject H ₀
Risk monitoring	.329	.105	.357	3.127	.002	Significant	Reject H ₀

As shown in table 4.1, the Risk-based Approaches particularly Risk identification, Risk control, and Risk monitoring, significantly impacted the Organizational Resilience in terms of Leadership and Culture. The generated probability values of efficiency were .005, .007, and .002, respectively, which were less than the level of significance ($P < .05$), thus the null hypothesis is rejected.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



Table 4.2

Regression Analysis on the Impact of the Risk-based Approaches to Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A terms of Network & Relationships

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Decision	Remarks
	B	Beta	Beta				
(Constant)	.476	.267		1.783	.078		
Risk identification	.280	.125	.235	2.239	.028	Significant	Reject H ₀
Risk analysis	.076	.150	.076	.509	.612	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
Risk response	-.036	.107	-.041	-.333	.740	Not Significant	Accept H ₀
Risk control	.288	.141	.291	2.041	.044	Significant	Reject H ₀
Risk monitoring	.260	.106	.300	2.457	.016	Significant	Reject H ₀

As shown in table 4.2, the Risk-based Approaches Particularly Risk identification, Risk control, and Risk monitoring, significantly impacts the Organizational Resilience in terms of Network and Relationships. The generated probability values of efficiency were .028, .044, and .016, respectively, which were less than the level of significance ($P < .05$), thus the null hypothesis is rejected.

The study revealed that the Risk-based Approaches Particularly Risk identification, Risk control, and Risk monitoring, significantly impacts the Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Network & Relationships.

Molfetas, Aris, Grava, Lars (2020) mentioned in a publication entitled Risk-Based Approaches to Business Regulation that risk-based regulation can play a role even in the most difficult environments, such as fragile and conflict-affected countries. RBR can put in place a

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



systematic methodology for ensuring public health and safety while easing the burden on low-risk businesses; guide decisions at all levels of government on what data is needed for evidence-based decision making; decrease discretionary decision-making by requiring justification for inspection targeting and regulatory enforcement; and provide a framework for allocating regulatory enforcement priorities. In addition, Organisational Resilience (2016) stated that networks and relationships attribute describe 'the internal and external relationships fostered and developed for the organization to leverage when needed'. It is the understanding of the relationships and resources that an organization may require from other organizations during times of adversity, as well as the necessary preparation and ongoing management to ensure this access.

Table 4.3
Regression Analysis on the Impact of the Risk-based Approaches to Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A terms of Change-Readiness

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.	Decision	Remarks
	Beta					
	B	Beta				
(Constant)	.376	.265	1.415	.161		
Risk identification	.210	.124	.173	1.687	.095	Not Significant Accept H ₀
Risk analysis	.320	.149	.313	2.148	.034	Significant Reject H ₀
Risk response	-.203	.107	-.230	-1.903	.060	Not Significant Accept H ₀
Risk control	.243	.140	.240	1.728	.088	Not Significant Accept H ₀
Risk monitoring	.305	.105	.345	2.902	.005	Significant Reject H ₀

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



As shown in table 4.3, the Risk-based Approaches Particularly Risk analysis and Risk monitoring, significantly impacted the Organizational Resilience in terms of Change-Readiness. The generated probability values of efficiency were .034 and .005, respectively, which were less than the level of significance ($P < .05$), thus the null hypothesis is rejected.

The study revealed that the Risk-based Approaches Particularly Risk Analysis and Risk monitoring, significantly impacts the Organizational Resilience in DTI IV-A in terms of Change-Readiness.

Louisot (2015) emphasized in "Volume 5, Issue 2 of the Risk governance and control: financial markets and institutions" that the core objective of any risk management effort is to ensure the organization survival whatever the circumstances it may be confronted to. One could argue that all that is required in terms of financial survival is enough cash to get through the period following a damaging event; however, this will only be sufficient if the company can maintain the trust and confidence of its stakeholders throughout the episode.

In relation to this, Walker (2019) pointed out that resilience referred to the constant anticipation and adjustment to "deep, secular trends that can permanently impair the earning power of a core business". It was about having the capacity to change before the case for change became desperately obvious. Organizational resilience was fundamentally about being proactive rather than reactive.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher has arrived at the following conclusions:

1. That in DTI IV-A, systematic risk identification practices are already in place. Feedbacks from clients are given due importance not only to determine what needs to be improved but is also used as a source to identify potentials risks. Moreover, risks are carefully examined and equally assessed through a matrix to reveal the probability of occurrence, and if there are underlying uncertainties that are associated with them. All interested parties and their relevant roles are also taken into consideration. This is important in order to determine the risk treatment for each risk identified.

Consequently, risk response strategies are planned, studied, discussed and are agreed upon by all parties involved. Likewise, it is ensured that these responses are doable and that catch-up actions can be done within the intended timeline. Furthermore, after due implementation of risk responses, controls are institutionalized by providing a safe space for employees and clients. In addition, because risks are identified, analyzed and responded to accordingly, proactive measures are set to mitigate and or keep them in control.

Lastly, risk responses are being re-assessed to determine its usefulness and accuracy in present conditions and whether or not there is a need to calibrate those responses. Moreover, risk audits are conducted by composite teams and results are analyzed and evaluated to identify room for improvement.

2. That employees have the capacity to handle issues and concerns and are able to utilize their skills in problem-solving.

Additionally, the organization is able to establish harmonious relationships with networks and partners. The staffing plan is designed to anticipate emergency such as insufficiency in manpower so that someone would be ready to assume important functions, and organizational communication is given due importance. And finally, people within the organization discuss and understands that change is inevitable. When faced with challenges and emergency, employees are engaged in coming up with solutions and response plans. Likewise, change is recognized as a prerequisite for continuous improvement.

3. That the higher the level of the Risk-based Approaches Implementation, the higher the manifestation of Organizational Resilience are to be attained and vice versa.

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



4. That in general, the implementation of risk-based approaches significantly impacts the manifestation of organizational resilience of DTI IV-A.
5. That there is a need to devise an action plan to strengthen the implementation of risk-based approaches thereby enhancing organizational resilience of DTI IV-A.



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto



REFERENCES

- Aaron (2018). The Importance of Risk Control Measures in the Workplace. <https://conserve.com.au/risk-control-measures-in-workplace/>
- Barasa, E., Mbau, R. & Gilson L. (2018). What Is Resilience and How Can It Be Nurtured? A Systematic Review of Empirical Literature on Organizational Resilience. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29935126/>
- Brouggy, P. & Jerks, M. (2016). Organisational Resilience: Good Business Guide. <https://www.organisationalresilience.gov.au/Documents/Organisational-Resilience-Good-Business-Guide.PDF>
- Cole, S. (2021). <https://www.navexglobal.com/blog/article/risk-based-approach-regulatory-compliance/>
- Denyer, D. (2017). Organizational Resilience: A summary of academic evidence, business insights and new thinking
- Druml, D. (2018). <https://www.druml.com/real-risk-manager-construction-risk-management/>
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: a capability-based conceptualization. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Frago. (2017). Risk-based Management in the World of Threats and Opportunities: Project Controls Perspective. <http://www.planningplanet.com/blog/risk-based-management-framework-2>
- Global Risks Report. (2016). What are the top global risks for doing business? <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/01/what-are-the-risks-for-doing-business/>
- Greycampus. (2021). Plan Risk Responses. <https://www.greycampus.com/opencampus/project-management-professional/plan-risk-responses>
- Hayes, A. (2021). Simple Random Sample. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/simple-random-sample.asp>
- Hurley, K. (2020). <https://www.everydayhealth.com/wellness/resilience/>
- Kelly, M. (2019). Unraveling What a Risk-Based Approach Means. GanIntegrity blog. <https://www.ganintegrity.com/blog/what-a-risk-based-approach-means/>
- Kenton, W. (2021). Risk Control. <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/r/risk-control.asp>
- Kunkel, M. (2021) Why Enterprise Risk Management Is Key to Organizational Resilience. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2021/04/30/why-enterprise-risk-management-is-key-to-organizational-resilience/?sh=23b5c5143bea>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Louisot. (2015). Risk and/or Resilience Management. Risk governance & control: Financial markets & institutions. Volume 5, Issue 2.

Lucy, D & Shepherd, C. (2018). Organisational Resilience: Developing change-readiness. <https://www.roffeypark.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/Organisational-Resilience-Developing-Change-Readiness-Reduced-Size.pdf>

Molfetas, A., Grava, L. (2020). Risk-Based Approaches to Business Regulation. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/34675/A-Note-for-Reformers.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Moore, C. (2019). Resilience Theory: What Research Articles in Psychology Teach Us. <https://positivepsychology.com/resilience-theory/>

Mustieles, U. (2020). <https://askinglot.com/what-is-the-meaning-of-descriptive-correlational-method>

National Research Council. (2017). Environmental Clean-Up at Navy Facilities: Risk-Based Methods. <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/6330/environmental-cleanup-at-navy-facilities-risk-based-methods>

Nichita, S. (2015). Theory of Constraints: A Literature Review. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/272392183_Theory_of_Constraints_A_Literature_Review

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2015). Managing Risks for a Cleaner Public Service. https://read.oecd-ilibrary.org/governance/brazil-oecd-integrity-review_9789264119321-en#page7

Organisational Resilience, (2016). Good Business Guide. <https://www.organisationalresilience.gov.au/Documents/Organisational-Resilience-Good-Business-Guide.PDF>

Pandya, A. (2017). <https://www.dashe.com/blog/so-you-think-you-can-change-quick-tips-for-conducting-change-readiness-assessment>

Ping, T & Muthueloo, R. (2015). The Impact of Enterprise Risk Management on Firm Performance: Evidence from Malaysia. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Impact-of-Enterprise-Risk-Management-on-Firm-Ping-Muthueloo/07ee4ad033f7a1f8e067063a0e8deef81ff636b8>

Planettogether. (2021). Goldratt's Theory of Constraints. <https://www.planettogether.com/blog/goldratts-theory-of-constraints>

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez, Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Ramirez, T. (2020). Sample Models and Best Practices: Applying A Risk-Based Approach to QMS Processes. <https://www.simplicitypd.com/blog/applying-a-risk-based-approach-to-qms-processes>

Resilient Organisations Ltd. (2021). How future ready is your organization? <https://www.resorgs.org.nz/our-services/resilience-benchmarking-tool/>

Resilient Organisations Ltd. (2021). What is organisational resilience?. <https://www.resorgs.org.nz/about-resorgs/what-is-organisational-resilience/>

Rosencrance, L. (2021). What is risk analysis and why it is important? <https://www.techtarget.com/searchsecurity/definition/risk-analysis>

Seville, E. (2015). Benchmark Resilience Tool (BRT-53).

Skillmaker. (2019). Risk Monitoring. <https://www.skillmaker.edu.au/risk-monitoring/>

Suarez, F. & Montes, J. (2020). Decision Making and Problem Solving: Building Organizational Resilience. <https://hbr.org/2020/11/building-organizational-resilience>

Thomas, C. (2020). Five Steps of the Risk Management Process. <https://www.360factors.com/blog/five-steps-of-risk-management-process/>

Thomson Financial Corporate Services. (2017) Thomson Financial Risk Management & Business Continuity Planning. <https://legal.thomsonreuters.com/en/products/compliance-learning/training-courses/business-continuity-management>

Trulioo. (2020). Risk-based approach – effective procedures to determine and manage AML risk. <https://www.trulioo.com/blog/risk-based-approach>

Wadesango, N., Mhaka, C. & Shava, F. (2018) Literature Review on the Effectiveness of Risk Management Systems on Financial Performance in A Public Setting. <https://www.proquest.com/openview/5348477f4eaf51247a1f98196a91bf48/1.pdf?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=38745>

Walker. (2019). What Is Organisational Resilience And Why Is it So Important? <https://www.readinow.com/blog/what-organisational-resilience-why-important>

Ward, S. (2020). <https://www.thebalancesmb.com/leadership-definition-2948275>

Watt, A. (2018). Risk Management Planning in Project Management. <https://opentextbc.ca/projectmanagement/front-matter/about-the-book/>

Webb, R. (2021). 8 Ways to Identify Risks in Your Organization. <https://www.clearrisk.com/risk-management-blog/8-ways-to-identify-risk-0-0>

Whitman, Z.R., Kachali, H., Roger, D., Vargo, J., Seville, E. (2015) Benchmark Resilience Tool (BRT-53)

Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto

INSTABRIGHT e-GAZETTE

ISSN: 2704-3010

Volume III, Issue IV

May 2022

Available online at <https://www.instabrightgazette.com>



Xiao, L. & Cao, H. (2017). Organizational Resilience: The Theoretical Model and Research Implication.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319486271_Organizational_Resilience_The_Theoretical_Model_and_Research_Implication
Zimmermann (2015). Characteristics of Culture in the Philippines.
<https://www.bartleby.com/essay/Characteristics-Of-Culture-In-The-Philippines-F3BWARSELF>



Editorial Team

Editor-in-Chief: Alvin B. Punongbayan

Associate Editor: Andro M. Bautista

Managing Editor: Raymart O. Basco

Web Editor: Nikko C. Panotes

Manuscript Editors / Reviewers:

Chin Wen Cong, Christopher DC. Francisco, Camille P. Alicaway, Pinky Jane A. Perez,
Mary Jane B. Custodio, Irene H. Andino, Mark-Jhon R. Prestoza, Keive O. Casimiro, Ma. Rhoda E. Panganiban
Rjay C. Calaguas, Mario A. Cudiamat, Jesson L. Hero, Albert Bulawat, Cris T. Zita, Allan M. Manaloto
