

Evaluation of Hazard Reporting Attitude among Aircraft Maintenance Students

Jason Louis C. Vallente

National Aviation Academy of the Philippines, Philippines

Abstract:

This study evaluated the hazard reporting attitude among aircraft maintenance students of the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-School of Aviation. Specifically, it determined the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of year level, sex, and age; assessed hazard reporting attitude in terms of safety culture, peer social influence, fear of unforeseen consequences, and personal reporting attitude; identified the problems encountered in hazard reporting; determined the relationship between demographic profile and hazard reporting attitude; and proposed intervention programs to improve hazard reporting practices. The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. A structured survey questionnaire was administered to 155 aircraft maintenance students enrolled in the Associate in Aircraft Maintenance Technology program. Data were treated using frequency, percentage, weighted mean, ranking, and Spearman's rho. The findings revealed that respondents were predominantly male, and the largest age group was 19 to 20 years old. The respondents manifested an overall Agree level of hazard reporting attitude across the four dimensions, with average weighted means of 2.94 for safety culture, 2.72 for peer social influence, 2.59 for fear of unforeseen consequences, and 2.87 for personal reporting attitude. Problems encountered in hazard reporting also obtained an Agree level, with an overall average weighted mean of 2.81. The most evident concerns were lack of clear understanding of the hazard reporting procedure and limited access to hazard reporting forms or systems, both obtaining a mean of 2.88. No significant relationship was found between the demographic profile and hazard reporting attitude. Year level obtained a Spearman's rho of -0.117 with $p = 0.147$, age obtained $\rho = 0.105$ with $p = 0.195$, and sex obtained $\rho = 0.038$ with $p = 0.636$. The most preferred interventions were regular safety briefings, positive instructor response, and demonstrations of the proper hazard reporting procedure. The study concludes that although students generally demonstrate a favorable attitude toward hazard reporting, procedural barriers and reporting system limitations remain evident in the training environment.

Keywords: hazard reporting, safety culture, aircraft maintenance students, safety management, peer social influence, reporting attitude

I. INTRODUCTION

Safety reporting is an essential part of aviation maintenance operations, supporting accident prevention during training and future operations. In aviation education, safety attitudes develop during laboratory activities, and students form reporting habits before entering professional maintenance work. Aircraft maintenance students regularly engage in hands-on laboratory tasks involving tools, equipment, and simulated aircraft components. Hazards may include improper tool use, equipment malfunction, or unsafe

behavior. Effective hazard reporting during training supports a strong safety culture, while weak reporting attitudes may increase the risk of unsafe practices becoming accepted over time.

In many aviation training organizations, hazard reporting systems exist; however, student participation in these systems varies. Fear of academic consequences affects reporting behavior, peer influence discourages reporting during laboratory activities, and some students doubt that reports will lead to corrective action. Hazard reporting serves as a fundamental element of Safety Management systems, promoting the proactive identification of risks. In aviation maintenance training, laboratories serve as controlled learning environments that provide a structured setting for hands-on training and expose students to realistic maintenance hazards.

Students are introduced to safety rules early in the program, but compliance does not always reflect positive attitudes toward reporting. Some students follow procedures but avoid reporting hazards, a behavior that limits organizational learning and weakens preventive safety action. Safety laboratory activities require constant situational awareness, and instructors cannot observe all hazards at all times. Student reporting therefore becomes a critical safety defense, and attitude influences whether a student reports or remains silent.

Previous aviation safety research often focuses on licensed technicians, while student-level data remain limited. Local studies in aviation education focus more on compliance than attitude, creating a research gap in training institutions. Understanding hazard reporting attitude helps evaluate training effectiveness and supports the improvement of safety instruction strategies. Early intervention strengthens long-term safety behavior, which is essential before students transition to industry roles.

The University of Perpetual Help System Laguna – School of Aviation is an approved aviation training organization by the Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines. The institution conducts a variety of safety laboratory activities, and aircraft maintenance students are required to follow safety procedures. However, formal evaluation of students' hazard reporting attitude at the training level remains limited in available local studies, creating uncertainty in safety culture development at the student level. This study therefore focuses on Aircraft Maintenance students enrolled in the Associate in Aircraft Maintenance Technology (AAMT) program, examining attitudes toward hazard reporting during the safety laboratory using a numerical approach.

Hence, this study aimed to evaluate the hazard reporting attitude among aircraft maintenance students of the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna–School of Aviation. Specifically, it determined the respondents' demographic profile in terms of year level, sex, and age; assessed hazard reporting attitude in terms of safety culture, peer social influence, fear of unforeseen consequences, and personal reporting attitude; identified the problems encountered in hazard reporting; determined the relationship between demographic profile and hazard reporting attitude; and proposed intervention programs to improve hazard reporting practices. The study was guided by the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the demographic profile of the students and their hazard reporting attitude.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to describe the hazard reporting attitude among aircraft maintenance students and to examine the significant association between selected demographic factors and hazard reporting attitude during safety laboratory activities. No variables were manipulated during the conduct of the study, which focused on observing naturally occurring conditions and examining statistical relationships rather than establishing cause-and-effect relationships.

The study was conducted at the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-School of Aviation, targeting students enrolled in the Associate in Aircraft Maintenance Technology (AAMT) program. A total enumeration sampling technique was employed, in which all students who were officially enrolled in the program and actively participating in safety laboratory activities at the time of data collection were invited to participate, yielding 155 respondents.

A structured self-administered questionnaire, developed from related literature on hazard reporting, safety culture, and reporting behavior in aviation maintenance, served as the primary data collection instrument. It consisted of four parts: demographic characteristics (sex, age, and year level); hazard reporting attitude across four dimensions (Safety Culture, Peer Social Influence, Fear of Unforeseen Consequences, and Personal Reporting Attitude); problems encountered by students in hazard reporting during laboratory activities; and recommendations to improve hazard reporting among students. A four-point Likert scale without a neutral option was used to measure the respondents' level of agreement with each statement, with higher scores indicating a more positive hazard reporting attitude. Weighted means were interpreted as follows: 3.25–4.00, Strongly Agree; 2.50–3.24, Agree; 1.75–2.49, Disagree; and 1.00–1.74, Strongly Disagree.

The research instrument was subjected to content validation before data collection by a panel consisting of a Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines Airworthiness Inspector, the Head of Training of the University of Perpetual Help System Laguna-School of Aviation, and a Safety Supervisor Officer from the institution's Occupational Health, Safety and Environment Office, namely Mr. Paolo Ricardo A. Quiestas, MEAM; Mr. Paul Andrew Caabay, CAAP Airworthiness Inspector; and Ms. Eloisa E. Rentoria, Supervisor-Safety Officer IV. These validators evaluated the questionnaire in terms of clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives and variables, and their comments were incorporated into the final questionnaire.

Ethical standards were strictly observed, including institutional approval from the School of Aviation administration, coordination with instructors, informed participation, and assurances of confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation. The questionnaire was administered online through Google Forms, and responses were reviewed for completeness before statistical processing. Data were encoded, tabulated, and analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage were used to describe the demographic characteristics of the respondents; weighted mean was used to determine the level of hazard reporting attitude across the four dimensions and the problems encountered in hazard reporting; Spearman's rho was used to determine the relationship between the demographic characteristics and hazard reporting attitude; and ranking was used to identify the relative priority of the proposed intervention programs. The level of significance was set at 0.05.

III.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the results of the study and situates the findings within the context of existing literature. It examines the demographic profile of the respondents, hazard reporting attitude, problems encountered in hazard reporting, the relationship between demographic profile and hazard reporting attitude, and the preferred intervention programs.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Profile	Frequency	Percentage
First Year	87	56.13%
Second Year	68	43.87%
Total	155	100.00%
Male	126	81.29%
Female	29	18.71%
Total	155	100.00%
17–18 years old	34	21.93%
19–20 years old	79	50.97%
21 years old and above	42	27.10%
Total	155	100.00%

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of the respondents. There were 87 respondents or 56.13% in the first year level, while 68 respondents or 43.87% were in the second year level. There were 126 male respondents or 81.29%, while 29 or 18.71% were female respondents. The sample was therefore predominantly male, consistent with the enrollment pattern commonly observed in aircraft maintenance training. The largest age group consisted of 79 respondents or 50.97% aged 19–20 years, followed by 42 respondents or 27.10% aged 21 years and above, and 34 respondents or 21.93% aged 17–18 years.

Table 2. Hazard Reporting Attitude of Aircraft Maintenance Students in Terms of Safety Culture

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Clearly emphasizing safety during laboratory activities	3.17	Agree
2. Encouraging students to report hazards by instructors	2.95	Agree
3. Taking reported hazards seriously by instructors	3.00	Agree
4. Supporting open safety communication within the laboratory environment	3.08	Agree
5. Leading hazard reports to corrective actions	2.92	Agree
6. Enforcing safety rules consistently in the laboratory	2.94	Agree
7. Treating hazard reporting as standard practice	2.82	Agree
8. Prioritizing safety over task completion	2.91	Agree
9. Providing clear safety guidelines during laboratory work	3.06	Agree
10. Trusting the school's laboratory safety system	2.60	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.94	Agree

Table 2 presents the mean distribution of the level of agreement on hazard reporting attitude among aircraft maintenance students in terms of safety culture. The average weighted mean of 2.94 indicates that safety culture practices are present within the laboratory environment; however, the value indicates moderate agreement, suggesting that while safety practices are present, there is still room to strengthen the safety culture. The highest mean of 3.17 on clearly emphasizing safety during laboratory activities indicates that safety is visibly integrated into instructional practices, implying that instructors consistently highlight safety procedures during laboratory sessions. The relatively high means for open safety communication (3.08) and provision of clear safety guidelines (3.06) further suggest that structural elements of safety culture are established within the learning environment. These components align with the concept of informed culture, where individuals are aware of safety expectations and procedures. According to Abari et al. (2024), safety culture in approved training organizations is strengthened when policies, communication, and participation are consistently reinforced in academic settings.

The means for encouraging hazard reporting (2.95) and taking reported hazards seriously (3.00) show that students perceive instructor support in reporting mechanisms, reflecting elements of reporting culture and just culture. Çoban and Bükeç (2024) emphasized that just culture begins with fair treatment and instructor openness, especially in training institutions where professional values are still forming. When students feel that instructors treat reports seriously, the foundation for voluntary reporting behavior is strengthened. However, the lower mean of 2.60 on trusting the school's laboratory safety system indicates comparatively weaker confidence in institutional safety structures. Under and Gerede (2021) explained that when individuals perceive gaps between policy and actual corrective action, reporting behavior may decline despite formal safety systems being in place.

Similarly, the means related to corrective action (2.92) and prioritizing safety over task completion (2.91) indicate agreement but not strong conviction, suggesting that students may still observe occasional tension between productivity and safety priorities. Lam and Chan (2023) found that organizational culture and perceived operational pressure affect reporting willingness even when formal systems exist. Overall, the moderate level of agreement suggests that safety culture remains procedural rather than deeply embedded. Strengthening visible corrective actions, improving feedback mechanisms, and consistently demonstrating non-punitive response can help elevate safety culture from compliance-based agreement to a more internalized commitment among aircraft maintenance students.

Table 3. Hazard Reporting Attitude of Aircraft Maintenance Students in Terms of Peer Social Influence

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Supporting hazard reporting among classmates	2.76	Agree
2. Feeling comfortable reporting hazards despite others not reporting	2.46	Disagree
3. Influencing reporting decisions through peer reactions	2.68	Agree
4. Worrying about being judged by classmates when reporting hazards	2.47	Disagree
5. Discussing safety issues openly among students in the laboratory	2.81	Agree
6. Affecting willingness to report hazards through peer behavior	2.70	Agree
7. Feeling encouraged when other students report hazards	2.84	Agree

8. Hesitating to report hazards when classmates remain silent	2.52	Agree
9. Valuing safety reporting among classmates	2.91	Agree
10. Influencing safety decisions through peer attitudes	3.06	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.72	Agree

Table 3 presents the mean distribution of the level of agreement on hazard reporting attitude in terms of peer social influence. The overall average weighted mean of 2.72 indicates that respondents generally agree that peer dynamics influence their hazard reporting behavior, suggesting that social interaction within the laboratory environment plays a significant role in shaping reporting decisions. The highest mean of 3.06 on the influence of peer attitudes on safety decisions indicates that students recognize the strong impact of classmates' perspectives on their own safety behavior. Similarly, valuing safety reporting among classmates (2.91) and feeling encouraged when other students report hazards (2.84) show that positive peer modeling strengthens reporting willingness. Lam and Chan (2023) emphasized that group culture and peer norms significantly influence maintenance personnel's willingness to report unsafe practices, a pattern that appears to begin at the training level.

The mean of 2.81 on openly discussing safety issues among students further indicates that peer-level communication exists in the laboratory environment. According to Galeos et al. (2024), collaborative dialogue in aviation education enhances safety participation and strengthens collective accountability. However, contrasting responses reveal subtle social pressures: respondents disagreed with feeling comfortable reporting hazards despite others not reporting (2.46) and with worrying about being judged (2.47). These results suggest that while fear of judgement may not be strongly present, comfort levels decrease when reporting behavior is not modeled by peers. The mean of 2.52 on hesitating to report hazards when classmates remain silent supports this pattern.

This pattern reflects social conformity dynamics: when reporting is visibly supported, students feel encouraged, and when reporting is absent, hesitation increases. Under and Gereide (2021) explained that silence within groups can indirectly suppress reporting behavior, even in the absence of formal punishment. Overall, the results indicate that peer social influence plays a meaningful role in shaping hazard reporting behavior, highlighting the importance of fostering a laboratory environment where reporting is normalized and actively practiced among students.

Table 4. Hazard Reporting Attitude of Aircraft Maintenance Students in Terms of Fear of Unforeseen Consequences

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Fearing academic consequences when reporting hazards	2.62	Agree
2. Worrying about conflict with others due to hazard reporting	2.65	Agree
3. Affecting class standing as a result of reporting hazards	2.50	Agree
4. Avoiding negative attention by hesitating to report hazards	2.55	Agree
5. Feeling safe from punishment when reporting hazards	2.31	Disagree
6. Experiencing stress when reporting hazards	2.45	Disagree

7. Fearing blame after reporting a hazard	2.59	Agree
8. Worrying about instructors misinterpreting reported hazards	2.89	Agree
9. Being concerned about social consequences after reporting hazards	2.76	Agree
10. Preventing hazard reporting due to fear	2.54	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.59	Agree

Table 4 presents the mean distribution of the level of agreement on hazard reporting attitude in terms of fear of unforeseen consequences. The overall average weighted mean of 2.59 indicates that fear-related factors influence hazard reporting behavior, though not to an extreme degree. The highest mean of 2.89 on worrying about instructors misinterpreting reported hazards indicates that students are particularly sensitive to how their reports may be perceived by authority figures. Under and Gereide (2021) explained that fear of misinterpretation and perceived blame contribute to organizational silence in aviation maintenance environments, and the same psychological mechanism appears at the student level.

Agreement with fearing academic consequences (2.62) and worrying about conflict with others (2.65) further supports the presence of apprehension. Lam and Chan (2023) emphasized that perceived risk of negative repercussions, whether formal or informal, reduces willingness to report unsafe practices. The disagreement with feeling safe from punishment (2.31) is particularly important, indicating that students are not fully confident that reporting is entirely free from punitive consequences. Çoban and Bükeç (2024) noted that just culture requires a clear distinction between acceptable error and punishable behavior; when this distinction is unclear, fear persists and voluntary reporting weakens.

Interestingly, respondents disagreed with experiencing stress when reporting hazards (2.45), suggesting that while fear exists conceptually, it may not manifest as intense emotional distress but rather as a cognitive concern that students weigh before deciding to report. Fear does not dominate the environment, but it remains a noticeable barrier. Strengthening just culture principles, reinforcing clear non-punitive policies, and providing consistent feedback after reports can help reduce perceived risks and encourage more confident participation in hazard reporting.

Table 5. Hazard Reporting Attitude of Aircraft Maintenance Students in Terms of Personal Reporting Attitude

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Viewing hazard reporting as a personal responsibility	3.06	Agree
2. Considering hazard reporting as part of their duty as students	3.03	Agree
3. Feeling morally obligated to report unsafe conditions	2.92	Agree
4. Reporting hazards even without being instructed	2.68	Agree
5. Demonstrating professional integrity through hazard reporting	2.83	Agree
6. Reporting hazards despite inconvenience	2.72	Agree
7. Prioritizing hazard reporting as a personal safety practice	3.07	Agree
8. Feeling confident in identifying reportable hazards	2.62	Agree

9. Taking personal accountability through hazard reporting	2.75	Agree
10. Intending to report hazards consistently in future maintenance work	3.04	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.87	Agree

Table 5 presents the mean distribution of the level of agreement on hazard reporting attitude in terms of personal reporting attitude. The overall average weighted mean of 2.87 indicates that respondents generally agree that hazard reporting is a personal responsibility and part of their developing professional identity. The highest means are observed in prioritizing hazard reporting as a personal safety practice (3.07), viewing hazard reporting as a personal responsibility (3.06), and intending to report hazards consistently in future maintenance work (3.04). Sese (2023) emphasized that next generation aviation professionals contribute to safety culture through personal adherence to procedures and proactive safety participation, and the present findings support this perspective at the student level.

Students also agree that hazard reporting is part of their duty as learners (3.03) and that they feel morally obligated to report unsafe conditions (2.92), reflecting internalized safety values. Çoban and Bükeç (2024) noted that the development of safety values during training influences long-term professional behavior in maintenance settings. However, relatively lower means are observed in reporting hazards even without being instructed (2.68) and feeling confident in identifying reportable hazards (2.62), suggesting that while students believe reporting is important, their confidence in independently recognizing hazards may still be developing. Lam and Chan (2023) explained that safety reporting behavior depends not only on willingness but also on perceived competence and clarity in identifying unsafe conditions.

The moderate agreement in reporting despite inconvenience (2.72) and taking personal accountability (2.75) indicates that students are generally willing to act, yet practical barriers may still influence behavior. Under and Gereade (2021) emphasized that a positive reporting attitude must be supported by an enabling environment to translate into actual reporting behavior. Strengthening both confidence and moral commitment through continuous training and scenario-based hazard identification exercises can help ensure that personal reporting attitude evolves into consistent professional practice in future maintenance work.

Table 6. Problems Encountered by Aircraft Maintenance Students in Hazard Reporting

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Being uncertain about situations that should be reported as hazards	2.76	Agree
2. Lacking clear understanding of the hazard reporting procedure	2.88	Agree
3. Experiencing limited time to report hazards during laboratory activities	2.81	Agree
4. Experiencing additional workload or inconvenience when reporting hazards	2.84	Agree
5. Receiving little or no feedback after reporting hazards	2.70	Agree
6. Encountering unclear hazard reporting procedures	2.86	Agree

7. Being unsure of the appropriate person to report hazards to	2.68	Agree
8. Experiencing limited access to hazard reporting forms or systems	2.88	Agree
9. Lacking confidence in identifying hazards	2.79	Agree
10. Experiencing absence of clear follow-up after hazard reporting	2.85	Agree
Average Weighted Mean	2.81	Agree

Table 6 presents the problems encountered by aircraft maintenance students in hazard reporting. The overall average weighted mean of 2.81 indicates that respondents generally agree that they experience noticeable procedural and practical challenges when reporting hazards, suggesting that although students demonstrate positive reporting attitudes, system-related barriers may hinder consistent reporting behavior. The highest means, observed in lacking a clear understanding of the hazard reporting procedure and experiencing limited access to hazard reporting forms or systems (both at 2.88), indicate that structural clarity and accessibility remain areas of concern. Abari et al. (2024) emphasized that effective safety culture in training institutions requires clear and accessible reporting mechanisms to ensure active participation.

Similarly, encountering unclear hazard reporting procedures (2.86) and experiencing the absence of clear follow-up after hazard reporting (2.85) suggest gaps in procedural transparency and feedback mechanisms. Under and Gerebe (2021) explained that the lack of visible corrective action and feedback can contribute to reporting fatigue and eventual silence. Students also agreed that additional workload or inconvenience when reporting hazards (2.84) and limited time during laboratory activities (2.81) are challenges. Lam and Chan (2023) found that production pressure and perceived inconvenience reduce willingness to report unsafe practices in maintenance environments, a dynamic that appears to extend to the academic laboratory setting.

The agreement with being uncertain about situations that should be reported as hazards (2.76) and lacking confidence in identifying hazards (2.79) reflects developmental factors, as hazard recognition skills may still be maturing among students. Galeos et al. (2024) highlighted the importance of continuous training and practical exposure in strengthening safety awareness in aviation education. The findings suggest that the primary issues are not rooted in a negative attitude but in system clarity, accessibility, feedback consistency, and time constraints. Strengthening procedural orientation, simplifying reporting systems, ensuring visible follow-up actions, and integrating reporting opportunities within laboratory flow can significantly improve hazard reporting effectiveness among aircraft maintenance students.

Table 7. Relationship Between the Demographic Profile and Hazard Reporting Attitude of Aircraft Maintenance Students

Demographic Variable	Spearman's rho (ρ)	p-value	Interpretation
Year Level	-.117	.147	Not Significant
Age	.105	.195	Not Significant
Sex	.038	.636	Not Significant

Not significant at $p > .05$

Table 7 presents the relationship between the demographic profile and hazard reporting attitude of aircraft maintenance students. Year level obtained $\rho = -0.117$ with $p = 0.147$ (a weak negative correlation), age obtained $\rho = 0.105$ with $p = 0.195$ (a weak positive correlation), and sex obtained $\rho = 0.038$ with $p = 0.636$ (a negligible correlation). Since all p-values were greater than 0.05, the relationships were not statistically significant, and the null hypothesis was accepted. This indicates that reporting attitude should not be assumed to differ based solely on year level, age, or sex, suggesting that hazard reporting attitude is shaped more by training environment, instructor behavior, and peer dynamics than by demographic characteristics alone.

Table 8. Preferred Intervention Programs to Improve Hazard Reporting

Recommendation	Frequency	Rank
Provide regular safety briefings on how and when to report hazards	137	1st
Ensure instructors respond positively when students report hazards	132	2nd
Conduct demonstrations of the proper hazard reporting procedure	129	3rd
Discuss real examples of hazards reported in the laboratory	127	4th
Make hazard reporting forms easily accessible in laboratories	123	5th
Include hazard reporting topics in regular laboratory orientations	118	6th
Simplify the hazard reporting process to reduce time and effort	118	6th
Allow anonymous hazard reporting options	117	8th
Provide feedback after a hazard report is submitted	114	9th
Recognize students who actively participate in safety reporting	100	10th

Table 8 presents the preferred intervention programs to improve hazard reporting. The highest-ranked recommendation was providing regular safety briefings on how and when to report hazards ($f = 137$), indicating that students perceive continuous reinforcement and structured guidance as the most important intervention. Abari et al. (2024) emphasized that ongoing safety communication is essential in cultivating an active reporting culture within training institutions. The second-ranked recommendation, ensuring instructors respond positively when students report hazards ($f = 132$), highlights the importance of instructor behavior in shaping reporting confidence; this aligns with earlier results on fear of misinterpretation by instructors, and Under and Gerede (2021) noted that perceived fairness and constructive treatment are central to sustaining voluntary reporting.

The third-ranked recommendation, conducting demonstrations of the proper hazard reporting procedure ($f = 129$), addresses procedural clarity and reduces uncertainty identified in the problems encountered. Discussing real examples of hazards reported in the laboratory ranked fourth ($f = 127$); Lam and Chan (2023) explained that contextual learning strengthens safety decision-making by making risks tangible. Mid-ranked recommendations, including making hazard reporting forms easily accessible, including

reporting topics in regular orientations, and simplifying the reporting process, confirm that accessibility and efficiency are important practical considerations.

Lower-ranked recommendations, including allowing anonymous hazard reporting options and providing feedback after a hazard report is submitted, remain valued despite their lower rank. Recognizing students who actively participate in safety reporting ranked last ($f = 100$), suggesting that students prioritize system clarity and instructor support over reward-based recognition. The ranking pattern demonstrates that students emphasize clarity, consistency, instructor support, and practical guidance as key interventions. Effective intervention programs should therefore focus on strengthening communication, simplifying procedures, providing demonstrations, and reinforcing positive instructor responses, measures likely to enhance confidence and normalize reporting behavior within the aircraft maintenance laboratory environment.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

This study concludes that aircraft maintenance students generally demonstrate a favorable attitude toward hazard reporting across safety culture, peer social influence, fear of unforeseen consequences, and personal reporting attitude. However, procedural barriers and reporting-system limitations remain evident, particularly uncertainty regarding what should be reported and limited access to reporting forms or systems. The respondents were predominantly male, with the largest age group being 19–20 years old and first-year students comprising the larger year-level group. Year level, age, and sex were not significantly related to hazard reporting attitude, indicating that reporting attitude should not be assumed to differ based solely on these demographic characteristics.

The preferred intervention strategies were regular safety briefings on how and when to report hazards, positive instructor response when students report hazards, and demonstrations of the proper hazard reporting procedure. Hence, the School of Aviation is encouraged to develop a standardized hazard reporting procedure, conduct regular reporting briefings and demonstration-based activities, reinforce supportive and non-punitive instructor responses, and strengthen accessible reporting tools and consistent feedback mechanisms to further embed a positive hazard reporting culture among aircraft maintenance students.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher expresses sincere appreciation to the administrators, faculty members, validators, and aircraft maintenance students who contributed to the completion of this study. Gratitude is also extended to the individuals and offices who provided guidance, institutional support, and participation during the data-gathering and instrument-validation processes.

REFERENCES

1. Abari, J. B., Cortez, R. O. F., & Sario, J. A. (2024). Safety culture of approved training organizations: Basis for an emergency response plan manual. *Asia Pacific Journal of Advanced Education and Technology*.
2. Aktas, E., & Kağrıoğlu, C. H. (2023). Factors affecting safety behaviors of aircraft maintenance technicians. *Safety Science*, 164, 106146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2023.106146>
3. Barrameda, R. J. M., Florencondia, N. T., & Villar, M. J. M. (2025). Assessment of safety management system (SMS) effectiveness in small commercial airlines in the Philippines. *IRE Journals*.

4. Civil Aviation Authority of Singapore. (2024). Handbook on aviation safety culture. https://www.caas.gov.sg/docs/default-source/docs---cc/e1952_safety-culture-handbook-v1-15_final.pdf
5. Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines. (2011). Implementing an acceptable safety management system (AC 01-004). https://caap.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/ac_01-004_sms_system_caap_a2011.pdf
6. Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines. (2019). Civil aviation regulations: Safety management (2nd ed.). https://caap.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/CAR-Safety-Management-2nd-Edition_Uncontrolled-Copy.pdf
7. Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines. (2025). Philippine civil aviation regulations part 3: Approved training organizations. <https://www.caap.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2025/07/PART-3-Approved-Training-Organizations.pdf>
8. Civil Aviation Authority of the Philippines. (2025). State safety program (4th ed.). <https://www.caap.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2026/02/State-Safety-Program-4th-Edition.pdf>
9. Çoban, R., & Bükeç, C. M. (2024). Just culture in aviation: A metaphorical study on aircraft maintenance students. *International Journal of Aviation, Aeronautics, and Aerospace*, 11(1), Article 1868. <https://doi.org/10.58940/2374-6793.1868>
10. Escalante, M. L. G., Mallari, M. O., & Florencondia, N. T. (2025). A comprehensive study on aircraft hangar safety practices in the Philippine State College of Aeronautics. *IRE Journals*, 8(11).
11. European Union Aviation Safety Agency. (2022). Easy access rules for occurrence reporting (Regulation [EU] No 376/2014): Revision from December 2022. <https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/document-library/easy-access-rules/occurrence-reporting-rule-book-easy-access-rules>
12. European Union Aviation Safety Agency. (2025). Effective aviation safety occurrence reporting systems.
13. Galeos, E. A., Tomon, K. A., Cabardo, D. L., Mercado, Z. A., Toring, E. E., Toring, K. N., Legaspi, N., Maming, J. B., & Tus, J. (2024). Ensuring aircraft safety: A case study on maintenance operations at an aerospace university in Lapu-Lapu City, Cebu. *Journal of Advanced Studies in Aviation, Aerospace, and Management*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14560908>
14. International Civil Aviation Organization. (2018). Safety management manual (4th ed., Doc 9859). International Civil Aviation Organization.
15. International Civil Aviation Organization. (2022). Safety culture and safety information protection.
16. Lam, S. T. F., & Chan, A. H. S. (2023). Technicians' attitudes to report unsafe practices in aircraft maintenance. In *Emerging technologies and future of work* (Vol. 117, pp. 243–252). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40852-7_25
17. Sese, L. T. (2023). Next generation aviation professionals' contribution to the safety culture of selected local airlines [Master's thesis, Philippine State College of Aeronautics].
18. Truong, D., & Lee, S.-A. (2025). Developing a new safety culture framework for aviation maintenance: Preliminary results. *Safety Science*, 183, 106729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2024.106729>
19. Under, I., & Gereade, E. (2021). Silence in aviation: Development and validation of a tool to measure reasons for aircraft maintenance staff not reporting. *Organizacija*, 54(1), 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2021-0001>