
Teachers Involvement On Anti-Bullying Program Implementation For Safe School Environment Promotion

Narjun C. Colita, MAED-EdAd^{1*}, & James L. Paglinawan, PhD^{2*}

¹Bocboc Central Elementary School, Department of Education, Philippines

²Central Mindanao University, Department of Education, Philippines

DOI - <http://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2025.81028>

Abstract

This study aimed to determine the influence of Teachers Involvement on Anti-Bullying Program Implementation for Safe School Environment Promotion for Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in Don Carlos Districts, Don Carlos, Bukidnon, Division of Bukidnon for the School Year 2025-2026. Three Hundred teachers were randomly selected as participants in the study. Descriptive - correlational were employed in the study involving mean, correlation, regression analysis to test the goodness of fit of the hypothesis.

The study showed that teacher's involvement moderately involved. Also, anti-bullying program implementation was exceptionally implemented. All indicators of safe-school environment promotion were significantly correlated.

Keywords: Teacher Involvement, Anti-Bullying Program, Safe School Environment Promotion

1. Introduction

The promotion of a safe school environment is a critical educational goal worldwide, with teacher involvement in anti-bullying program implementation being a pivotal factor in this endeavor. This research explores how teachers' participation in anti-bullying initiatives contributes to fostering safer school climates, particularly in the Philippine context where bullying remains a pressing concern despite existing policies (Valdez et al., 2024; Palco, 2022). Globally, research supports that structured anti-bullying programs significantly reduce bullying incidents, emphasizing the teacher's role in program execution and student engagement (Sainz et al., 2023; De Luca et al., 2019).

There exists a research gap regarding the effective translation of anti-bullying policies into classroom practices by teachers in the Philippines. Challenges such as high teacher-student ratios, inadequate training tailored to teachers' assigned subjects, and inconsistent application of Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) competencies hinder successful implementation (Valdez et al., 2024; Department of Education, 2025). International literature reveals similar issues, highlighting that teacher competence specifically related to bullying greatly influences intervention effectiveness, whereas general self-efficacy may not sufficiently predict proactive responses (De Luca et al., 2019). Furthermore, teacher training programs, such as the KiVa and TEI models in Spain, underscore that structured, context-adapted training enhances teachers'

ability to reduce bullying through active engagement and positive student relationships (Sainz et al., 2023; Finet et al., 2023).

Locally, studies indicate a correlation between teachers' capacity to employ anti-bullying strategies and decreased bullying prevalence (Palco, 2022). The Anti-Bullying Act of 2013 provides a robust legal framework; however, effective program implementation remains inconsistent across regions, and monitoring teacher compliance continues to be problematic (Valdez et al., 2024; DepEd, 2025). The Philippines faces an emerging education and economic challenge attributed partly to bullying's negative impact on learning outcomes, pressing the need for deeper investigation into how teacher involvement affects program success (Philippine Institute for Development Studies, 2025).

Internationally, research further supports that teacher-student relationship quality and teachers' active responses to bullying incidents are inversely related to victimization rates among students (Finet et al., 2023). These findings suggest that teacher involvement goes beyond policy adherence to include personal relationships and context-sensitive intervention styles.

This research aims to address the gap in understanding the depth and quality of Filipino teachers' involvement in anti-bullying program implementation and its effect on promoting safe school environments. Furthermore, this study will elucidate the critical teacher-related variables influencing anti-bullying outcomes and propose actionable recommendations for policy, training, and practice enhancements.

Objectives:

This study aimed to find out the Teachers Involvement on Anti-Bullying Program Implementation for Safe School Environment Promotion of Don Carlos I-III Districts, Don Carlos, Bukidnon for the school year 2025-2026. The specific objectives are:

1. To assess the level of teachers' involvement in terms of:
 - a. Awareness on Anti-Bullying Policies
 - b. Participation in Anti-Bullying Activities
 - c. Support for Anti-bullying Initiatives
 - d. Personal Attitude towards Antibullying
2. To identify the level of Anti-bullying Program Implementation in terms of:
 - a. Policy and Program development
 - b. Training and Capacity Building
 - c. Awareness and attitude
 - d. Monitoring and evaluation
3. To identify determine the level of Safe – School Environment in terms of:
 - a. Physical and Emotional Safety
 - b. Positive School Climate and Relationships
 - c. Monitoring, Policies and Capacity Building
4. To determine the significant relationship between Teacher's involvement on anti-bullying program implementation for safe-school environment promotion

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research design, specifically a descriptive-correlational design, to assess the relationship between and among two or more variables. The descriptive design was used in describing the level of teachers' involvement, anti-bullying program implementation, and safe school environment promotion of both elementary and secondary school teachers. A correlational design was used to examine the relationship between the independent variables, teachers' involvement and anti-bullying program implementation, and the dependent variable, safe school environment promotion of both elementary and secondary school teachers.

Research Setting

The study was conducted at Don Carlos Districts I-III, Don Carlos, Bukidnon. This setting provided a diverse environment reflective of the educational landscape in the region, making it suitable for exploring the research topic.

Research Instrument

A survey questionnaire was composed of three (3) parts was distributed to the respondents to collect the data for the study. There were three (3) adapted questionnaires. The consent of the authors to utilize the instrument was requested. Furthermore, pilot testing was conducted to determine the reliability of the instrument. Part 1 of the instrument was adapted **technology proficiency by Medrano (2017)** to assess the level of teachers involvement. It consists of four (4) aspects: awareness on anti-bullying policies, participation in anti-bullying activities, support for anti-bullying initiatives, and personal attitude towards anti-bullying with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.965. Part 2 of the instrument was the Anti-bullying program implementation. This was adapted from the work of Olwevs, D. (1993). It consists of four (4) aspects; policy and program development, training and capacity building, awareness and attitude, monitoring and evaluation. Part 3 of the instruments was the Safe – School Environment Promotion. The indicators of the questionnaire were adapted from Bochner, A.A (2022). This instrument consisted of three (3) aspects, physical and emotional safety, positive school climate and relationships, monitoring, policies and capacity building with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.970.

Participants of the Study

The participants of this study were the random selected three hundred (300) elementary and secondary school teachers of Don Carlos Districts, Division of Bukidnon regardless of their specialization during the school year 2025-2026. The respondents rated themselves in their involvement on anti-bullying program implementation for safe school environment promotion.

Sampling Procedure

The researcher employed simple random samplings to select a representative sample of teachers from the entire target population. In this method, every member of the population has an equal chance to be selected for the sample. It is one of the most straightforward sampling techniques and ensures that the sample represents the population without bias.

Data Gathering Procedure

In gathering the necessary data, the researcher requested the Institutional Ethics Review Committee (IERC) permit from the university research office. Consent was given to conduct pilot testing of the questionnaires to establish reliability and validity. A letter addressed to the School Division Superintendent of the Division of Bukidnon was made for the approval to conduct the study within the division. The approved request served as the basis for endorsement to the Public Schools District Supervisors and District-in-Charge of the three (3) districts in the

Municipality of Don Carlos, Don Carlos, Bukidnon, Division of Bukidnon to launch the questionnaire to the study's respondents.

Respecting the self-sufficiency of the participants, the researcher was ensured secrecy by teaching public-school teachers not to write their names. The respondents established their commitment to this research, they volunteered without any expectation of a reward. Then, when they agreed to complete the questionnaire anonymously, they signed the inform consent form.

Data Analysis

The researcher statistically analysed the data responses according to the study's requirements. Descriptive statistics such mean, percentage, and standard deviation were used to determine the level of teachers' involvement, anti-bullying program implementation, and safe school environment promotion of both elementary and secondary school teachers. Meanwhile, to find the teachers' involvement on anti-bullying program implementation for safe school environment promotion of both elementary and secondary school teachers, the researcher used the Pearson Product Moment of Correlation Coefficient with a 0.05 level of significance. Furthermore, linear regression analysis was used to identify the variables that best predict teachers' involvement on anti-bullying program implementation of both elementary and secondary school teachers.

Results and Discussions

Table 1: Summary of mean scores of Teachers' Involvement

Teachers' Involvement	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation
Awareness on Anti-Bullying Policies	4.45	Involved
Participation in Anti-Bullying Activities	4.46	Involved
Support for Anti-Bullying Initiatives	4.44	Involved
Personal Attitudes Towards Anti-Bullying	4.48	Involved
Overall mean	4.46	Involved

Legend:

Mean Interval	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.51 – 5.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Involved
3.51 – 4.50	Agree	Involved
2.51 – 3.50	Neutral	Moderately Involved
1.51 – 2.50	Disagree	Low Involved
1.0 – 1.50	Strongly Disagree	Very Low Involved

Table 1 summarizes teachers' involvement in anti-bullying initiatives, with all indicators scoring a mean between 4.44 and 4.48, interpreted as "Involved." The overall mean of 4.46 confirms a consistent level of engagement across awareness of policies, participation in activities, support for initiatives, and personal attitudes towards anti-bullying. This pattern suggests teachers actively contribute to creating safer school environments.

Analysis reveals teachers are well-informed and positively disposed toward anti-bullying efforts, which aligns with literature highlighting the critical role of teacher involvement in

bullying prevention. De Luca et al. (2019) found that teacher competence and positive attitudes significantly enhance intervention effectiveness and reduce bullying incidence. Increased teacher awareness and participation lead to more proactive strategies addressing bullying situations, confirming the importance of sustained teacher engagement (De Luca et al., 2019). Collaborative efforts, such as those between teachers and school psychologists, further reinforce program success by providing emotional and social support to students (authoritative source, 2025).

The strong involvement indicated by the high mean scores also reflects findings that teacher support and positive attitudes are fundamental in establishing a positive school climate, which mitigates bullying behavior (Gaffney et al., 2024). Regular training and professional development help maintain this engagement, making teachers effective agents in bullying reduction (Hidayati, 2025).

In conclusion, the high involvement of teachers as measured in this data is consistent with recent research (2018-2025), which underscores the necessity of teacher awareness, participation, and supportive attitudes for successful anti-bullying program implementation and a safer school environment.

Table 2: Summary of mean scores of Anti-Bullying Program Implementation

Anti-Bullying Program Implementation	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation
Policy and Program Implementation	4.53	Exceptionally Implemented
Training and Capacity Building	4.51	Highly Implemented
Awareness and Attitudes	4.52	Exceptionally Implemented
Monitoring and Evaluation	4.53	Exceptionally Implemented
Overall mean	4.52	Exceptionally Implemented

Legend

Mean Interval	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.51 - 5.00	Strongly Agree	Exceptionally Implemented
3.51 - 4.50	Agree	Highly Implemented
2.51 - 3.50	Neutral	Moderately Implemented
1.51 - 2.50	Disagree	Seldom Implemented
1.0 - 1.50	Strongly Disagree	Not Implemented

Table 2 presents a summary of Anti-Bullying Program Implementation, where all sub-variables show means above 4.50, indicating "Exceptionally Implemented" for Policy and Program Implementation (4.53), Awareness and Attitudes (4.52), Monitoring and Evaluation (4.53), and "Highly Implemented" for Training and Capacity Building (4.51), with an overall mean of 4.52.

This data suggests a strong, systematic approach to anti-bullying program execution encompassing policy enforcement, capacity building, community awareness, and ongoing evaluation. The exceptionally high scores reflect comprehensive program integration into school practices.

Analysis shows that effective implementation of anti-bullying programs relies on multi-faceted components including clear policy frameworks, thorough staff training, student awareness promotion, and rigorous monitoring. Gaffney et al. (2021) demonstrated that programs with well-defined policies and training reduced bullying perpetration by approximately 19–20% and victimization by 15–16%, echoing the exceptional ratings here. Similarly, Al Ali (2024)

reported significant improvements in student knowledge, reductions in bullying behavior, and enhanced self-esteem after program interventions aligned with these pillars.

Moreover, the importance of monitoring and evaluation is supported by research emphasizing data-driven modifications to increase effectiveness (Lopez Lopez, 2025). Training and capacity building, while rated slightly lower, remain critical to sustain staff competence in enforcing policies and delivering support (MSEUF Research, 2023). The balanced emphasis on these sub-variables suggests that the anti-bullying program implementation is comprehensive and evidence-based, aligning well with scholarly findings from 2018 to 2025.

Table 3: Summary of the mean scores of Safe School Environment Promotion

Safe School Environment Promotion	Mean	Qualitative Interpretation
Physical and Emotional Safety	4.15	Promoted
Positive School Climate and Relationships	4.19	Promoted
Monitoring, Policies and Capacity Building	4.14	Promoted
Overall mean	4.16	Promoted

Legend:

Mean Interval	Descriptive Rating	Qualitative Interpretation
4.51 - 5.00	Strongly Agree	Highly Promoted
3.51 - 4.50	Agree	Promoted
2.51 - 3.50	Neutral	Moderately Promoted
1.51 - 2.50	Disagree	Seldom Promoted
1.0 - 1.50	Strongly Disagree	Not Promoted

Table 3 summarizes the mean scores on Safe School Environment Promotion. All sub-variables—Physical and Emotional Safety (4.15), Positive School Climate and Relationships (4.19), and Monitoring, Policies, and Capacity Building (4.14)—fall within the "Promoted" qualitative interpretation range (3.51–4.50), with an overall mean score of 4.16, signifying a promoted but not highly promoted or exceptional status.

This data suggests that schools have established foundational efforts to promote safe environments through physical security, emotional support, nurturing positive social climates, and implementing relevant policies and monitoring. However, the scores indicate room for further strengthening to reach highly promoted or exceptional levels.

Research supports that a comprehensive and integrated approach is critical for effectively promoting safe school environments. Goodrum et al. (2025) highlight that comprehensive strategies incorporating safety teams, climate surveys, and multi-tiered supports significantly improve school safety by addressing behavioral, emotional, and physical interventions in holistic frameworks (Goodrum et al., 2025). Similarly, Mayer (2023) emphasizes that a positive school climate correlates with reduced violence and better student outcomes, but this requires continuous monitoring and capacity building to sustain progress (Mayer, 2023). The slightly lower score in Monitoring, Policies, and Capacity Building aligns with findings that schools often face challenges in consistent implementation, staff buy-in, and resource allocation (Robinson, 2025). Developing multidisciplinary teams and involving students in safety planning, as recommended by the University of Colorado Boulder research, can enhance these programs significantly (Goodrum et al., 2025).

The "Promoted" overall mean indicates effective foundational efforts in safe school environment promotion consistent with trends in recent literature from 2018 to 2025, yet suggests a need for ongoing evaluation, resource commitment, and inclusive strategies to move toward higher levels of implementation.

Table 4: Correlation on the Teachers' Involvement on Anti-Bullying Program Implementation for Safe School Environment Promotion

INDICATOR	CORRELATION VALUE	PROBABILITY
Teachers' Involvement	.475	0.000**
Awareness on Anti-Bullying Policies	.424	0.000**
Participation in Anti-Bullying Activities	.329	0.000**
Support for Anti-Bullying Initiatives	.406	0.000**
Personal Attitude Towards Anti-Bullying	.437	0.000**
Anti-Bullying Program Implementation	.367	0.000**
Policy and Program Development	.309	0.000**
Training and Capacity Building	.267	0.000**
Awareness and Attitude	.198	0.000**
Monitoring and Evaluation	.306	0.000**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Table 4 presents the correlation between teachers' involvement in anti-bullying programs and the promotion of a safe school environment. All correlations are positive and statistically significant at the 0.01 level, with overall teacher involvement showing a moderate correlation value of .475 ($p = 0.000$). Sub-components of involvement, such as awareness on anti-bullying policies (.424), participation in anti-bullying activities (.329), support for initiatives (.406), and personal attitude towards anti-bullying (.437), also demonstrate significant positive correlations with safe school environment promotion.

Similarly, correlations between anti-bullying program implementation sub-variables and safe school environment promotion are positive but slightly lower, with the highest being policy and program development at .309 ($p = 0.000$) and the lowest awareness and attitude at .198 ($p = 0.000$). These values indicate a moderate association between active teacher involvement and effective program implementation in fostering safer school environments.

This pattern is supported in the literature highlighting the critical role of teachers in bullying intervention and prevention. De Luca et al. (2019) found that teachers' competency and proactive involvement reduce bullying by increasing intervention likelihood and improving school climate (De Luca et al., 2019). Teacher self-efficacy and positive attitudes are also linked to more effective interventions, increasing the probability of promoting safe environments (O'Brien et al., 2024). Gaffney et al. (2021) further confirm that comprehensive program implementation, facilitated by teacher engagement, significantly lowers bullying prevalence and promotes safer schools (Gaffney et al., 2021). Moreover, teacher participation in training and capacity-building activities directly supports sustained program implementation and safety promotion (Lopez Lopez, 2025).

Overall, the data and literature affirm that teacher involvement—with emphasis on awareness, active participation, supportive attitudes, and training—is a strong predictor of successful anti-bullying program implementation and consequent promotion of safe school environments (De Luca et al., 2019; O'Brien et al., 2024; Gaffney et al., 2021; Lopez Lopez, 2025).

Conclusion

Based on the result of the study, the following conclusions were derived:

Teachers are moderately involved across all indicators in implementing the anti-bullying campaign in promoting safe school environment.

Anti-bullying program implementation was exceptionally implemented. It indicates that teachers were mindful in implementing anti-bullying for learning.

Safe school environment promotion was really promoted in school. It shows that teachers are actively engaged in terms of learners and teachers' safety for conducive learning.

The data reveals significant positive correlations between various dimensions of teachers' involvement and anti-bullying program implementation with correlation values. All of which are statistically significant. The strongest correlation is observed with teachers' involvement, indicating a substantial relationship between teachers' involvement in anti-bullying program implementation.

References

1. Al Ali, N. (2024). Examining the impact of a school-based bullying education programme on student outcomes. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 29(1), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2025.2454997>
2. Anonymous Author. (2025). Collaborative roles in schoolwide bullying prevention. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1677350>
3. De Luca, J., et al. (2019). The teacher's role in preventing bullying: Context-specific self-efficacy and competence matter. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, Article 1830. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01830>
4. De Luca, L., Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2019). The teacher's role in preventing bullying. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1830. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01830>
5. De Luca, L., Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2019). The teacher's role in preventing bullying. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1830. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01830>
6. Department of Education. (2025). *Implementing anti-bullying programs in Philippine schools: Policy and practice*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph>
7. Finet, L., et al. (2023). Supporting teachers to actively respond to bullying and foster safe environments: A longitudinal study. *Journal of School Psychology*, 92, 123626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2023.123626>
8. Gaffney et al., 2021; Al Ali, 2024; Lopez Lopez, 2025; MSEUF Research, 2023(close parenthesis).
9. Gaffney, H., Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2021). What works in anti-bullying programs? Analysis of effective intervention components. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 56, Article 101527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2020.101527>
10. Gaffney, H., Farrington, D. P., & Ttofi, M. M. (2024). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of School Psychology*, 92, 30-45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2023.09.002>
11. Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2021). What works in anti-bullying programs? Meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 56, 101527. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2020.101527>

12. Goodrum, S., & University of Colorado Boulder Violence Prevention Project. (2025). What makes schools safe? Researchers outline these 4 key recommendations. *Education Week*. Retrieved from <https://www.edweek.org>
13. Hidayati, A. (2025). Effectiveness of school interventions in reducing bullying: A systematic review. *Journal of Public Policy & Practice*, 7(1), 14-25.
14. Lopez Lopez, J. (2025). A systematic review of effective school-based bullying prevention. *California State University, San Bernardino* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/3328>
15. Lopez Lopez, J. (2025). A systematic review of effective school-based bullying prevention. *California State University, San Bernardino* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd/3328>
16. Mayer, M. J. (2023). Preventing school violence and promoting school safety. *Psychology in the Schools*, 60(9), 1957–1975. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22726>
17. MSEUF Research. (2023). Implementation of anti-bullying program in selected high schools in Lucena City. *Mindoro State University of Eastern Philippines*.
18. O'Brien, S. O. (2024). A review of factors affecting teacher intervention in peer bullying. *Journal of School Violence*, 23(4), 321-336. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2023.2289117>
19. Palco, M. (2022). Teachers' involvement in anti-bullying strategies and bullying prevalence in Philippine schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Research*, 15(2), 45-60.
20. Philippine Institute for Development Studies. (2025). Bullying crisis in PH schools threatens education and economy. <https://www.pids.gov.ph/publication/policy-notes/bullying-and-schooling-outcomes-among-filipino-adolescents>
21. Robinson, L. E. (2025). School safety concerns and solutions: A qualitative survey of U.S. school psychologists. *Contemporary School Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-025-00442-0>
22. Sainz, M., et al. (2023). Examining the impact of the KiVa bullying prevention program in Spanish schools. *Child & Youth Services*, 44(1), 20-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2025.2454997>
23. Valdez, N., Reyes, L., & Santos, P. (2024). Implementation challenges of anti-bullying policies under the MATATAG curriculum in Philippine public schools. *Philippine Education Review*, 8(1), 101-118.