

The Status of the Anti – Bullying Policy of MSU – LNCAT Campus: Basis for an Intervention Plan

Nor-Ain Hassan Alim, Phd

MSU – Lanao National College of Arts & Trades, Marawi City, Philippines

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2025.903SEDU0615>

Received: 26 October 2025; Accepted: 01 November 2025; Published: 08 November 2025

ABSTRACT

The study sought to find out the status of the anti – bullying policy of MSU – LNCAT campus. Specifically, this study answered the questions; what are the profiles of the respondents in terms of age, gender and length of service; what is the status of the anti – bullying policy of the campus in terms of types of bullying inside the campus, and school strategies; and is there a need for an intervention program? It used the descriptive-survey method of research. A questionnaire was the primary tool used in gathering data. The respondents of the study were the Junior High School Department employees. In analyzing the data that were gathered, the frequency count and simple percentage were used to determine the profiles and observations of the respondents.

The results disclosed that majority of the respondents revealed that the social bullying, verbal bullying, and physical bullying existed in the campus. Moreover, majority of the respondents confirmed that the school organized strategies such as promote students' awareness of their rights; establish and enforce clear and fair rules on bullying and involve students, teachers and parents in the school response; encourage bystanders to take immediate action, such as speaking up and reporting the incident; and provide a means for students to report bullying confidentially. Then, it suggested that the Anti-Bullying Policy of the campus had to be strengthened. The faculty had to be educated on the Anti – Bullying Methods to prevent the existing bullying in the campus. The level of awareness of the stakeholders had to be increased to stop bullying. And an intervention program was highly recommended to address the existing bullying.

Keywords: Status, Anti-Bullying, Intervention Plan

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a major issue in schools, according to the Programme for International Students Assessment (PISA) survey launched by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 2015 and published in 2017. The survey was responded to by 540,000 15-year-old students from 72 countries. Around 11% of students reported that other students made fun of them at least a few times per month, while 4% said they were hit or pushed around by other students at least a few times per month (PISA, 2017). This implies that school bullying needs to be addressed properly by school authorities.

Further, bullying in schools is a pervasive threat to the well-being and educational success of students. Bullying refers to unwanted aggressive behaviors enacted intentionally over time by an individual or group using some form of power to cause physical and/or psychological harm to another individual or group in a shared social context. Bullying is also a widespread phenomenon. A meta-analysis of 82 studies conducted in 22 countries in North America, South America, Europe, Southern Africa, East Asia, and Australia and Oceania found that 53% of youth were involved in bullying as bullies, victims, or both bullies and victims (Hall, 2017).

A study of Sanapo (2017) looked into prevalence rate of bullying victimization and perpetration as well as teachers' response to bullying incidence in the Philippines. A total of 340 sixth graders from five different schools in Western Visayas participated in the study. Slightly more than half (54.1%) of the sample were boys and 45.9%

were girls. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze data gathered from the survey. Children's self-reports revealed that prevalence rate for victimization was 40.6% and that for perpetration was 23.8%. Similar to previous literature, results also showed that there were significantly more boys than girls who reported to be victims ($\chi^2(1, N = 340) = 4.26, p = 0.039$) and bullies ($\chi^2(1, N = 340) = 4.35, p = 0.037$). Regardless of gender, verbal bullying came out as the most common type of bullying children experienced as a victim and bully. Teachers' response to bullying was all in line with direct sanctions, i.e. verbal reprimands, temporary removal from class, withdrawal of privileges, and suspension, which were imposed on individuals involved in bullying as bullies. Although all teachers and school personnel were required to report bullying cases they had knowledge of to the child protection committee in their institution, very few did so.

The Philippines is one of the first countries to implement an anti-bullying act in the world, former Education Secretary Luistro said. According to Education Secretary Sonny Angara, while Republic Act 10627 or the Anti-Bullying Act has been in place for over a decade, many schools still fail to implement its core provisions — including the setting up of child protection committees meant to respond promptly when bullying is reported. It is for this reason that the researcher conducted this study to find out the status of the anti – bullying policy of MSU – LNCAT campus.

METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive-survey method of research. It described the status of the anti – bullying policy of MSU – LNCAT campus during the School Year 2016 –2017. A questionnaire was the primary tool used in gathering data. The questionnaire was divided into two parts. The first part contained the profiles of the respondents. The second part dealt with the observation of the respondents on the status of the anti – bullying policy of the campus. In analyzing the data that were gathered, the Frequency Count and Simple Percentage were used to determine the profiles and observations of the respondents. The respondents of the study were the Junior High School Department employees.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions: what are the profiles of the respondents in terms of age, gender and length of service; what is the status of the anti – bullying policy of MSU – LNCAT Campus in terms of types of bullying inside the campus, and school strategies; and is there a need for an intervention program?

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows that nine (9) or 45.0% of the respondents were forty – one years old and above, seven (7) or 35.0% were in the age bracket of between 26 – 30 years old, two (2) or 10.0% were in the age bracket between 31 – 35 years old, and another two (2) or 10.0% were in the age bracket between 36 – 40 years old. The finding reveals that most of the respondents were in the age bracket of 41 years old and above.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Age

| Age | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------|
| 26 – 30 years old | 7 | 35.0 |
| 31 – 35 years old | 2 | 10.0 |
| 36 – 40 years old | 2 | 10.0 |
| 41 years old & above | 9 | 45.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 |

Table 2 reveals that nineteen (19) or 95.0% of the respondents were female and one (1) or 5.0% was a male. The finding shows that majority of the respondents were females.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Gender

| Gender | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| Male | 1 | 5.0 |
| Female | 19 | 19.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 |

Table 3 displays that ten (10) or 50.0% of the respondents were 16 or more years in service, six (6) or 30.0% were in the bracket of between 1 – 5 years in service, three (3) or 15.0% were in the bracket of between 6 – 10 years in service, and one (1) or 5.0% was in the bracket of between 11 – 15 years in service. The finding confirms that half of the respondents served 16 years or more in MSU-LNCAT.

Table 3. Frequency and Percentage Distribution of the Respondents' Length of Service

| Length of Service | Frequency | Percent |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------|
| 1 – 5 years | 6 | 30.0 |
| 6 – 10 years | 3 | 15.0 |
| 11 – 15 years | 1 | 5.0 |
| 16 years or more | 10 | 50.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 |

The respondents revealed in table 4 that the social bullying with a percentage of 85.0%, verbal bullying with a percentage of 65.0%, physical bullying with a percentage of 60.0%, and cyber bullying with a percentage of 45.0% existed in the campus.

They also confirmed that the school organized strategies such as Promote students' awareness of their rights with a percentage of 75.0%; Establish and enforce clear and fair rules on bullying and Involve students, teachers and parents in the school response with a percentage of 70.0%; Encourage bystanders to take immediate action, such as speaking up and reporting the incident with a percentage of 65.0%; and Provide a means for students to report bullying confidentially with a percentage of 55.0%. This implied that bullying still exists in the campus even though the school organized strategies to prevent and to address the bullying incidents.

Table 4. Status of the Anti – Bullying Policy of MSU – LNCAT Campus

| Types of Bullying | Frequency | Percent |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| 1. Physical | 12 | 60.0 |
| 2. Verbal | 13 | 65.0 |
| 3. Social | 17 | 85.0 |
| 4. Cyber-bullying | 9 | 45.0 |
| School Strategies | Frequency | Percent |

| | | |
|--|----|------|
| 1. Establish and enforce clear and fair rules on bullying | 14 | 70.0 |
| 2. Promote students' awareness of their rights | 15 | 75.0 |
| 3. Provide a means for students to report bullying confidentially | 11 | 55.0 |
| 4. Encourage bystanders to take immediate action, such as speaking up and reporting the incident | 13 | 65.0 |
| 5. Involve students, teachers and parents in the school response | 14 | 70.0 |

CONCLUSION

In light of the findings, it suggested that the Anti-Bullying Policy of MSU – LNCAT campus had to be strengthened. The faculty had to be educated on the Anti – Bullying Methods to prevent the existing bullying in the campus. The level of awareness of the stakeholders had to be increased to stop bullying. And an intervention program was highly recommended to address the existing bullying.

Thus, a 3-day seminar-workshop was proposed. This seminar – workshop was compliant to R.A. 10627 and to Department of Education Child Protection Policy. It would develop the knowledge and skills of the School Administrators/Faculty in preventing or responding to any bullying act. This intervention program would be conducted purposely to:

1. Strengthen the Anti-Bullying Policy of MSU – LNCAT campus;
2. Implement the Republic Act No.10627 or otherwise known as the “Anti-Bullying Act of 2013”;
3. Fully impose the DepEd Order No.40 series of 2012 or the DepEd Child Protection Policy;
4. Update the stakeholders on the campus policy for conflict resolution;
5. Educate the faculty on Anti-Bullying Methods to prevent internal and external bullying; and
6. Increase the level of awareness of the stakeholders on the said circumstances.

REFERENCES

1. PISA (29 June 2017). PISA 2015 data reveals that bullying is a major issue in schools. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/pisa-2015-data-reveals-bullying-major-issue-schools>
2. Hall, W. (Spring 2017). The Effectiveness of Policy Interventions for School Bullying: A Systematic Review. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/690565>
3. Sanapo, M. (14 December 2017). When Kids Hurt Other Kids: Bullying in Philippine Schools. <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=81190>
4. Republic Act 10627. https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2013/ra_10627_2013.html
5. Botones, Maria Arlene A. The Conflict Management Style of School Administrators and Teachers in the School Districts of CARCAR: Basis for an Intervention Program. Dissertation. Marawi City: Mindanao State University
6. Gatab, Erlinda M. Factors Affecting Teaching Performance and Management of Learning Outcomes of Fourth Year Public Secondary School Teachers of Lanao del Norte: Bases for an Intervention Program. Dissertation. Marawi City: Mindanao State University