



PROMOTING A SAFE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: ROLE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN ADDRESSING BULLYING AT SULU COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY INC. AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS

Melsaida J. Sadjail, LPT, Salman E. Albani, Ed.D

*Graduate School of Education, Mindanao State University-Sulu,
Jolo, Sulu, Philippines*

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the role of school administrators in addressing bullying at Sulu College of Technology, Inc., focusing on the alignment between documented bullying incidents and teachers' perceptions of administrative strategies within a localized educational context. Employing a descriptive research design, data were collected from 50 purposively sampled teachers using an adapted questionnaire and supplemented with official school bullying incident records from the 2024–2025 academic year; analysis included descriptive statistics and an independent-samples t-test to examine gender differences in bullying prevalence. Results reveal a low overall bullying incidence rate of 1.98%, with physical bullying constituting 44.8% and cyberbullying 29.9% of cases; no statistically significant difference was found between male and female students' reported bullying levels. Teachers consistently perceived administrative anti-bullying measures as highly implemented, with a grand mean of 4.31 indicating "Always Practiced" strategies such as policy enforcement, confidential reporting, stakeholder coordination, and positive behavior reinforcement. These findings demonstrate that effective school leadership translates national child-protection mandates into visible, consistent, and inclusive operational practices that sustain a safe learning environment. The study contributes to the understanding of bullying prevention as a governance issue, emphasizing the critical impact of administrative leadership on school climate and student welfare in culturally diverse and socioeconomically varied settings.

Keywords: *Bullying prevention, school administrators, administrative strategies, bullying incidents, school climate*

INTRODUCTION

Education constitutes a fundamental human right and a strategic mechanism for human capital formation, social mobility, civic participation, and national development. As formal institutions of learning, schools function not merely as instructional sites but as structured social ecosystems where learners acquire academic competencies, internalize social norms, develop interpersonal skills, and construct identities within regulated environments. The attainment of these developmental functions, however, is substantially compromised when the school climate is disrupted by bullying (Ocupa-Cabrera & Cajavilca-Lagos, 2026; Zahrani, 2024). Bullying represents a persistent and relational form of student misconduct characterized by repeated aggressive behavior, intentional harm, and an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and the victim (Ajibewa et al., 2025; Zahrani, 2024). Its manifestations may be physical, verbal, social, or cyber in nature, and its consequences extend beyond immediate interpersonal conflict to include diminished academic engagement, profound psychological distress, increased absenteeism, weakened institutional trust, and reduced instructional effectiveness (Batool et al., 2025; Liu et al., 2025; Zahrani, 2024).

In the Philippine educational context, bullying remains a serious concern requiring sustained administrative and policy attention. Nationally reported data have shown that a substantial proportion of Filipino learners experience bullying, with the Philippines reporting some of the highest bullying rates globally; public summaries of PISA-related findings report that 65% of Filipino students experienced some form of bullying at least a few times a month (Abrigo et al., 2024). Recent data continues to indicate gender-differentiated exposure, with variations in how boys and girls experience physical versus relational victimization (Abrigo et al., 2024; Batool et al., 2025). These prevalence indicators demonstrate that bullying is not an isolated disciplinary problem but a systemic school-climate issue with implications for learner safety, academic continuity, and institutional accountability (Nacua, 2025). Consistent with this concern, the Department of Education issued DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012 (the DepEd Child Protection Policy), providing policy and guidelines for protecting children in school from abuse, exploitation, discrimination, and bullying (ALIPASA et al., 2026; Nacua, 2025). This policy framework places a clear institutional obligation on schools to establish preventive, protective, and remedial mechanisms that safeguard learners and ensure that bullying incidents are addressed through formal procedures.

Within this regulatory context, school administrators occupy a central position in translating national child-protection mandates into operational school-based mechanisms (Goodness, 2025; Tulenbaevna et al., 2025). Their leadership responsibilities include formulating and enforcing anti-bullying policies, creating reporting and referral systems, implementing awareness programs, and cultivating a school climate that prioritizes anti-bullying efforts (Goodness, 2025; Zhang & Li, 2025). However, the mere existence of policy does not automatically guarantee effective implementation, as inconsistent enforcement remains a significant barrier to student safety (Goodness, 2025; Nacua, 2025). The operational efficacy of anti-bullying governance depends on how consistently, visibly, and equitably school administrators execute these policies within the daily life of the institution (Zhang & Li, 2025).

This study is situated at Sulu College of Technology, Inc., where administrative responses to bullying must be understood within the broader socio-cultural and institutional realities of the Sulu region. These realities intensify the need for strategic, culturally responsive, and evidence-informed administrative interventions (ALIPASA et al., 2026). In such a setting, teachers constitute a critical empirical source because they interact directly with learners, observe classroom dynamics, and experience the practical consequences of administrative decisions (Gordoncillo, 2025; Vandetta, 2025). Accordingly, teachers' perceptions provide a realistic diagnostic mechanism for evaluating whether administrative anti-bullying strategies are visible, consistent, and responsive in actual school practice (Gordoncillo, 2025; Tulenbaevna et al., 2025).

The research gap addressed by this inquiry lies in the distinction between policy presence and policy execution (Anggraeni et al., 2025; Nacua, 2025). While national frameworks such as DepEd Order No. 40, s. In 2012, the legal basis for protection was established, and the effectiveness of such mandates is ultimately determined at the institutional level through proactive leadership and robust support systems (Goodness, 2025; Zhang & Li, 2025). There remains a need to examine how school administrators' leadership practices align with documented bullying trends and how these practices are perceived by teachers positioned at the front line of student welfare (Goodness, 2025; Vandetta, 2025). Thus, this study contributes localized evidence on the relationship between administrative strategies and bullying outcomes within a specific institutional context.

Research Questions

This research examined bullying incidents and administrative responses at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. It began from a simple premise: addressing bullying in schools requires not only the presence of child-protection policies but also reliable documentation of incidents, awareness of gender-related differences, and clear administrative strategies observed by teachers in actual school practice. In this way, the study links the recorded occurrence of bullying to institutional actions taken to prevent, manage, and respond to it within the school setting.

Specifically, the study asked:

1. What is the level of bullying as reported in official incident records of Sulu College of Technology, Inc.?
2. Is there a significant difference in the level of bullying as reported in incident records when grouped according to the gender of the students involved?
3. What strategies do school administrators employ in addressing bullying as perceived by teachers?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design to examine the role of school administrators in addressing bullying at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. The descriptive part identified the strategies used by administrators and assessed the level of their implementation, as observed and perceived by the teachers. This design was appropriate because it allowed the researcher to describe existing conditions and practices without manipulation (Creswell & Creswell, 2022).

Furthermore, this methodological approach is consistent with recent studies in the Philippine context, such as research conducted in Mandaue City during the 2024–2025 academic year, which utilized similar descriptive frameworks to examine the implementation of mitigating measures and anti-bullying campaigns (SANOPAO, 2025a, 2025b). By using this design, the study effectively captures educators' lived perceptions of the visibility and consistency of administrative strategies in high school settings (Gordoncillo, 2025; Vandetta, 2025). This enables a realistic assessment of how national child-protection mandates are operationalized at the institutional level (Goodness, 2025; SANOPAO, 2025).

Research Locale

The study is conducted at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. (formerly Sulu Tong Jin School), a private school in Jolo, Sulu, which currently has programs for Junior High School, Senior High School, and College students. The school also offers various TESDA courses for students seeking a National Certificate (NC). Sulu College Technology, Inc., an International Standardization Organization (ISO) 9001:2015-certified organization, is also recognized by the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), the Department of Education, and the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA). The institution caters to students from various cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, making it an ideal setting for examining issues of bullying and the role of administrators in addressing them.

Sampling Design and Selection of Respondents

This study used a purposive sampling design, which involves the deliberate selection of participants based on specific qualifications relevant to the study's objectives. This sampling method is deemed appropriate because it ensures that the participants have the necessary experience and knowledge to provide reliable insights into the administrative strategies used to address bullying.

The respondents of this study comprised 50 teachers currently employed at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. They were selected based on their direct involvement in school activities and their ability to observe daily interactions among students. Furthermore, they were chosen because they have first-hand knowledge and experience

in implementing policies and in the role of school administrators in addressing bullying incidents. The study ensures that the findings reflect informed insights grounded in actual administrative practice and experience.

Research Instrument

The research instrument used in this study was an Adapted and Modified Questionnaire. It was constructed based on the concepts and items from the studies of Bauman et al. (2008) and other related literature on the roles of school administrators in addressing bullying. The original content was reviewed, revised, and adjusted by the researcher to suit the specific objectives and context of the current study.

The questionnaire is structured to gather essential data from respondents, including their personal profiles and observations of school administrators' practices. It utilizes a five-point Likert Scale ranging from 5 – Always Practiced, 4 – Often Practiced, 3 – Sometimes Practiced, 2 – Seldom Practiced, to 1 – Never Practiced. The instrument is designed in a checklist format, where respondents simply place a check mark corresponding to their assessment of various indicators related to policy implementation, preventive measures, interventions, and support systems for addressing bullying.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher followed a systematic and ethical process in gathering the necessary data for the study. Prior to the distribution of instruments, formal permission was secured through an approval letter addressed to the institution's school head. This step was undertaken to ensure that the research was duly authorized and aligned with the school's policies and regulations.

Upon approval, the researcher personally administered the validated questionnaires to the identified teachers who served as respondents. The purpose of the study was clearly explained, and the confidentiality of all responses was assured to encourage honest and accurate participation. In addition to the survey, official school records and incident reports regarding bullying cases for the School Year 2024-2025 were obtained from the guidance offices. These records were reviewed and summarized to determine the level and frequency of bullying incidents within the institution. After data collection, all responses were organized, tabulated, and encoded for statistical analysis. Appropriate descriptive statistics and t-test were applied to interpret the data and address the specific problems of the study.

Statistical Treatment of Data

In this study, frequency and percentage were used to determine the level and frequency of bullying incidents as reflected in the official school records. To analyze the strategies employed by school administrators, a weighted mean was computed from teachers' perceptions. Furthermore, a t-test for independent samples was employed to

determine whether there is a significant difference in the level of bullying incidents across groups defined by the students' gender.

RESULTS

Table 1
Bullying Incidents Records

Type of Bullying	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
Physical Bullying	30	44.8
Cyber Bullying	20	29.9
Verbal Bullying	12	17.9
Social Bullying	5	7.5
Total	67	100.00

The distribution of bullying incidents recorded during the 2024–2025 school year reflects a highly controlled disciplinary environment at Sulu College of Technology, Inc., where the occurrence of bullying remains exceptionally low. With only 67 recorded cases among an estimated 3,383 enrollees, the prevalence rate stands at just 1.98%, a figure that stands in sharp contrast to national trends, where 65% of Filipino students reported experiencing bullying at least a few times a month. This low incidence rate suggests that the institution's strategic leadership and enforcement of anti-bullying frameworks effectively maintain a safe, conducive learning environment for its students. Such success is often attributed to the proactive implementation of mitigating measures and child protection policies that translate national mandates into consistent, school-based safety protocols.

The specific breakdown of these incidents provides further insight into the nature of student misconduct within the institution. Physical bullying was identified as the most prevalent form, accounting for 44.8% (30 cases) of the total, aligning with current research, which identifies physical aggression as a primary and highly visible manifestation of peer victimization in structured social ecosystems (ALIPASA et al., 2026; Zahrani, 2024). Cyberbullying followed as the second most frequent type at 29.9% (20 cases), reflecting the growing challenge of digitalized peer aggression that administrators must address through evolving intervention programs (Batool et al., 2025; Zahrani, 2024). In contrast, the relatively lower numbers for verbal bullying (17.9%). Moreover, social bullying (7.5%) may indicate that teachers and school management are successfully cultivating a sense of school connectedness, thereby reducing relational aggression (Ajibewa et al., 2025; Tulenbaevna et al., 2025). Ultimately, the data demonstrate that, while negative behaviors exist, they are not systemic, highlighting the efficacy of the school's administrative strategies in prioritizing learner welfare and institutional discipline (Goodness, 2025; Gordoncillo, 2025).

Table 2
T-test result for Bullying by Gender

Sex	N	M	f	t-value	p-value	Decision	Remarks
Male	56	2.21	.475	.135	.493	Accepted	There is no significant difference.
Female	11	2.27					

The t-test results presented in Table 2 indicate no significant difference in the level of bullying between male students (56) and female students (11). With a computed p-value of .493, which exceeds the standard 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis is accepted, confirming that reported bullying experiences are statistically similar across genders within the school. This finding is consistent with recent cross-sectional research from 2024, which indicates a trend toward gender parity in bullying victimization, showing that both male and female students are often equally involved in bullying dynamics. Furthermore, systematic reviews and meta-analyses published in 2025 emphasize that while gender-differentiated patterns vary globally, bullying remains a widespread challenge that affects all student demographics across various educational settings.

The lack of a significant gender disparity suggests that the institution's disciplinary climate and safety protocols are experienced uniformly by all learners (Goodness, 2025). Research indicates that such consistency is typically achieved when school management teams and administrators prioritize enforcing standardized anti-bullying policies that prioritize the welfare of the entire student body (Goodness, 2025; Zhang & Li, 2025). While national data from the Philippines indicate high rates of exposure to bullying that may differ by gender in broader contexts, the localized results of this study indicate that the current school environment maintains an equitable level of safety for both sexes (Abrigo et al., 2024; Nacua, 2025). Ultimately, these findings support the implementation of universal administrative strategies that address bullying as a systemic school-climate issue, ensuring that prevention and intervention efforts remain inclusive of all students (Gordoncillo, 2025; Tulenbaevna et al., 2025).

Table 3
Strategies employed by School Administrators in addressing Bullying as perceived by teachers

Statements	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Description
Establishes and enforces clear anti-bullying policies.	50	4.28	.757	Always Practiced

Conducts regular meetings to review school safety and bullying prevention protocols.	50	3.98	1.020	Sometimes Practiced
Demonstrates strong leadership by modeling respect, empathy, and discipline to prevent bullying.	50	4.20	.926	Always Practiced
Organizes seminars or orientations on child protection, conflict resolution, and proper handling of bullying situations.	50	4.26	.876	Always Practiced
Engages parents and guardians through awareness programs regarding bullying prevention.	50	4.38	.830	Always Practiced
Integrates values education and positive behavior programs into the curriculum to stop bullying.	50	4.32	.741	Always Practiced
Promotes socio-emotional learning and peer mentoring to prevent aggressive and bullying behavior	50	4.30	.735	Always Practiced
Provides confidential channels or systems for reporting cases of bullying.	50	4.42	.731	Always Practiced
Ensures timely investigation and fair handling of reported bullying incidents.	50	4.34	.895	Always Practiced
Conducts counseling, mediation, or disciplinary conferences for students involved in bullying.	50	4.34	.939	Always Practiced
Coordinates with guidance offices, parents, and law enforcement when bullying cases require serious action.	50	4.48	.762	Always Practiced
Keeps accurate, up-to-date records of bullying incidents.	50	4.34	.745	Always Practiced
Uses data from bullying reports to design better prevention programs.	50	4.28	.882	Always Practiced
Conducts regular evaluations of school discipline and anti-bullying programs.	50	4.24	.916	Always Practiced
Recognizes and rewards positive student behavior and peaceful ways of resolving conflicts.	50	4.52	.707	Always Practiced
Grand Mean		4.31		Always Practiced

Legend: 1.00-1.80 Never Practiced, 1.81-2.60 Seldom Practiced, 2.61-3.40 Sometimes Practiced, 3.41-4.20 Often Practiced, 4.21-5.00 Always Practiced. Scales and descriptive limits are adapted from Alias (2014).

The findings in Table 4.3, showing a Grand Mean of 4.31 ("Always Practiced"), demonstrate that school administrators at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. are perceived as highly proactive and consistent in implementing anti-bullying strategies. This high level of implementation aligns with recent research emphasizing that strategic leadership is a cornerstone of creating safer school environments; effective management teams that prioritize anti-bullying policies contribute significantly to reducing student misconduct (Goodness, 2025; Zhang & Li, 2025). The perception that these strategies are "Always Practiced" suggests that the institution has successfully moved beyond mere policy presence to operational efficacy, a critical transition for ensuring that child protection mandates translate into actual learner safety (Anggraeni et al., 2025; Nacua, 2025).

The highest-ranked strategy, "Recognizing and rewarding positive student behavior" (), highlights a shift toward positive reinforcement as a primary tool for school discipline. Contemporary literature from 2025 supports this approach, noting that rewarding peaceful conflict resolution and modeling empathetic behavior are more effective in fostering a healthy school climate than purely punitive measures (Goodness, 2025; Zhang & Li, 2025). Similarly, the high scores for "Coordinating with guidance offices, parents, and law enforcement" () and "Engaging parents and guardians" () reflect a modern collaborative framework for bullying prevention. Recent studies underscore that the shared responsibility between administrators, teachers, and school psychologists is essential for maintaining a robust school-wide prevention system (Goodness, 2025; Tulenbaevna et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the emphasis on "Providing confidential reporting channels" () and "Ensuring timely investigation" () addresses a critical need for institutional trust. Research suggests that when administrators establish secure reporting systems, students and faculty feel more supported, which, in turn, improves the overall well-being of the school community (Gordoncillo, 2025; SANOPAO, 2025). While "Conducting regular meetings to review safety protocols" received the lowest mean (), it is still categorized as "Often Practiced," which mirrors common administrative challenges where time constraints may limit frequent formal reviews, despite a strong general commitment to the policy (Anggraeni et al., 2025; Goodness, 2025). Overall, these results demonstrate that the institution's administrative strategies are comprehensive, visible, and deeply integrated into the school's daily operations (Tulenbaevna et al., 2025; Zhang & Li, 2025).

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that bullying at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. was officially recorded at a low-level during School Year 2024–2025, with physical bullying emerging as the most frequently documented form, followed by cyberbullying, verbal bullying, and social bullying. The statistical analysis further showed no significant difference in the level of bullying incidents when grouped by the gender of the students involved; thus, the null hypothesis was retained, and any presumed gender-based difference was not empirically supported. Teachers also perceived the school administrators' anti-bullying strategies as consistently implemented, with the overall assessment rated "Always Practiced."

Collectively, these findings suggest that bullying exists within the institution but is being addressed through visible administrative mechanisms, structured reporting, intervention procedures, and preventive school-climate strategies.

The low recorded level of bullying may be interpreted as an indication of a relatively controlled disciplinary environment. However, this result should not be read simplistically as the absence of bullying. Official incident records capture only reported and documented cases; therefore, they are shaped by students' willingness to report, teachers' capacity to identify bullying, and the school's procedures for classifying incidents. The predominance of physical bullying suggests that visible and observable forms of aggression are more likely to enter official records. This aligns with the argument of Zahrani (2024) and ALIPASA et al. (2026) that physical bullying remains one of the most identifiable manifestations of peer aggression in structured school environments. By contrast, the lower frequency of verbal and social bullying may reflect either genuinely lower incidence or the difficulty of documenting less visible forms of victimization.

The relatively high proportion of cyberbullying is also analytically significant. It indicates that bullying within the school community is no longer confined to face-to-face interaction but extends into digital spaces where administrative monitoring is more difficult. This finding is consistent with Batool et al. (2025) and Liu et al. (2025), who emphasized that digital communication platforms have expanded the scope, speed, and psychological reach of peer victimization. For Sulu College of Technology, Inc., this implies that conventional discipline and classroom supervision must be complemented by digital citizenship education, online reporting systems, and coordinated parent-school monitoring.

The absence of a significant gender difference suggests that bullying incidents, as officially recorded, are not statistically concentrated among one gender group. This finding supports the view that bullying should be addressed as a whole-school concern rather than as a gender-specific problem. It agrees with recent studies noting that both male and female learners may be involved in bullying dynamics, although the forms and contexts of involvement may differ. Nevertheless, this finding requires cautious interpretation because the recorded cases were not evenly distributed between male and female students. The larger number of male-involved cases may have affected the statistical balance of the comparison. Moreover, gender differences may be obscured when analysis relies only on official records, since boys' involvement may be more visible in physical incidents. At the same time, girls' experiences may be more likely to appear in relational, verbal, or socially mediated forms that are less frequently reported.

Teachers' high assessment of administrative strategies indicates that school administrators are perceived as active agents in preventing and managing bullying. The strongest practices involved recognizing positive student behavior, coordinating with guidance offices, parents, and law enforcement, providing confidential reporting mechanisms, and ensuring timely investigation. These findings are consistent with Goodness (2025), Zhang and Li (2025), and Tulenbaevna et al. (2025), who emphasized that effective anti-bullying governance depends on the visibility, consistency, and

collaborative nature of school leadership. The results also support Nacua's (2025) distinction between policy presence and policy execution. In this study, teachers perceived that administrative action goes beyond formal compliance and is reflected in operational school practices.

However, the relatively lower rating for regular meetings on school safety and bullying prevention protocols suggests an area requiring institutional strengthening. Although still positively assessed, this result implies that monitoring and review mechanisms may not be as consistently embedded as direct intervention practices. This is important because sustainable anti-bullying work requires not only responding to cases but also periodically reviewing trends, evaluating procedures, and revising preventive programs based on evidence.

Theoretically, the study contributes to the literature on school safety by emphasizing the relationship between administrative leadership, documented bullying patterns, and teacher-perceived implementation. It supports the view that bullying prevention should be understood as a governance issue rather than merely a matter of individual student behavior. The findings reinforce the argument that school administrators shape institutional climate through policy enforcement, reporting systems, guidance coordination, parental engagement, and positive behavior reinforcement.

In practice, the findings suggest that Sulu College of Technology, Inc. should sustain its current anti-bullying mechanisms while strengthening monitoring, documentation, and digital safety. The low recorded prevalence should encourage continued prevention rather than institutional complacency. Since cyberbullying was the second-most-reported form, the school should expand its anti-bullying initiatives to include online conduct, responsible technology use, evidence preservation, and parent orientation on digital risks. The absence of significant gender differences also implies that interventions should remain inclusive, while still being sensitive to gendered patterns in the form, visibility, and reporting of bullying.

At the policy level, the study affirms the importance of localized implementation of child-protection mandates. National policies such as DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012 provided the formal framework, but their effectiveness depends on how school administrators operationalize them in daily practice. The findings, therefore, indicate that school-level leadership is central to transforming anti-bullying policy from a compliance requirement into a functioning system of learner protection.

Several limitations must be acknowledged. First, the study relied partly on official incident records, which may underestimate the actual occurrence of bullying because not all cases are reported, detected, or formally documented. This limitation is particularly relevant for verbal, relational, and cyber forms of bullying, which may occur outside direct adult supervision. Second, the assessment of administrative strategies was based on teacher perceptions. While teachers are credible informants because of their direct involvement in school operations, their perceptions may not fully represent the experiences of students, parents, or victims of bullying.

Third, the study was conducted at a single institution, limiting the generalizability of the findings to other schools in Sulu or similar educational contexts. Fourth, the gender comparison was based on an unequal distribution of male and female cases, which may have influenced the statistical sensitivity of the t-test. Finally, the study used a descriptive design; therefore, it cannot establish causal relationships between administrative strategies and the low recorded level of bullying.

Despite these limitations, the study remains valuable because it provides localized empirical evidence on how bullying is documented and administratively addressed within a specific school context. Future research may strengthen this inquiry by incorporating student interviews, parent perspectives, longitudinal incident tracking, and comparative analysis across multiple schools. Such approaches would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how administrative leadership influences bullying prevention, reporting behavior, and school safety outcomes.

Conclusions

This study establishes that the promotion of a safe learning environment at Sulu College of Technology, Inc. is closely tied to the school's administrative capacity to document bullying incidents, interpret gender-related patterns, and implement visible anti-bullying strategies, as perceived by teachers. Rather than treating bullying as a purely behavioral problem among students, the study positions it as an institutional concern that requires coordinated leadership, systematic monitoring, preventive education, and responsive intervention. The findings collectively indicate that bullying incidents within the institution were officially recorded at a low level, with physical bullying and cyberbullying emerging as the most documented forms. The absence of a significant difference in bullying when grouped according to gender suggests that anti-bullying interventions should remain inclusive and school-wide rather than narrowly directed toward one gender group. At the same time, teachers' high assessment of administrative strategies demonstrates that school leaders are perceived to be consistently enforcing policies, providing reporting mechanisms, coordinating with relevant stakeholders, and promoting positive student behavior. Taken together, these results show that administrative leadership functions as a critical mechanism through which child-protection policies are translated into actual school practice.

The significance of this study lies in its contribution to the continuing discourse on school safety, particularly in localized educational contexts where institutional realities shape the implementation of national child-protection mandates. Its practical value is evident in showing that effective bullying prevention depends not only on the existence of formal policies but also on the consistency, visibility, and credibility of administrative action. For school leaders, the findings underscore the need to sustain confidential reporting systems, data-informed prevention programs, parent-school collaboration, guidance intervention, and values-based behavioral reinforcement. For policy and practice, the study affirms that safe learning environments are built through whole-school governance rather than isolated disciplinary responses.

Nonetheless, the study is bound by several methodological constraints. It was conducted in a single institution and relied on official incident records and teacher perceptions, which may not fully capture unreported, hidden, or digitally mediated forms of bullying. The descriptive design also limits causal interpretation; therefore, the findings should be understood as evidence of patterns and perceived practices rather than proof of direct causality between administrative strategies and reduced bullying incidence.

Future research should extend this inquiry through multi-school comparative studies, longitudinal monitoring of bullying trends, and mixed-method designs that include students, parents, guidance personnel, and administrators. Further investigation should also examine cyberbullying more deeply, particularly the ways digital platforms complicate detection, reporting, and intervention. By building on the present study, future scholarship can develop a more comprehensive model of anti-bullying governance that integrates policy execution, school climate, student voice, and evidence-based administrative leadership.

Recommendations

In light of the findings and conclusions, the researcher proffers the following recommendations:

1. School Administrators are highly recommended to continue sustaining and strengthening the effective strategies currently being implemented, ensuring that policies, guidance services, and positive reinforcement programs remain consistent and responsive to the needs of the students. They may also enhance the conduct of regular meetings and reviews of safety protocols to improve existing measures further, while maintaining a continuous focus on addressing both physical and cyber bullying through relevant education and activities.
2. Teachers are recommended to remain active partners in observing and reporting incidents promptly, as well as in modeling and instilling values of respect, empathy, and kindness among students. Their continued vigilance and support in reinforcing positive discipline are essential to sustaining the institution's orderly and conducive atmosphere.
3. Future researchers may undertake similar studies in different educational contexts to further enrich the body of knowledge and provide a broader perspective on the issue. They may also explore other relevant variables such as the psychological effects of bullying, students' coping mechanisms, and the role of peer influence to gain a more holistic understanding of the problem, ultimately contributing to the continuous improvement of student welfare and school safety programs.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper. This study was conducted in accordance with ethical standards and principles. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, and their confidentiality and anonymity were strictly maintained. No harm was inflicted on the participants, and all data collected were used solely for academic and research purposes.

Acknowledgements

The researcher sincerely acknowledges the assistance, encouragement, motivation, and guidance of the following individuals who contributed to the completion of this study:

Nagder J. Abdurahman, Ed.D., Chancellor, for his support and encouragement; Salman E. Albani, Ed.D., Adviser, for his valuable guidance, scholarly advice, and patience throughout the conduct of this research.

The researcher is also deeply grateful to the teacher-respondents of Sulu College of Technology, Inc., for their cooperation, time, and willingness to participate in this research.

Sincere appreciation is likewise extended to the family, siblings, and parents for their financial and moral support, spiritual guidance, prayers, sacrifices, and understanding during the completion of this academic work.

REFERENCES

- Abrigo, M., Lingatong, E., & Relos, C. M. (2024). School Bullying Contributes to Lower PISA Achievement among Filipino Students: Who Gets Bullied? Why Does It Matter? <https://doi.org/10.62986/dp2024.45>
- Ajibewa, T. A., Kershaw, K. N., Carnethon, M. R., Heard-Garris, N., Beach, L. B., & Allen, N. B. (2025). Peer bullying victimization, psychological distress, and the protective role of school connectedness among adolescents. *BMC Public Health*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-025-24002-6>
- ALIPASA, J. B., Alipasa, C. D., Balagtas, R. J., Gollayan, M. S., & Lontoc, D. A. (2026). Silent Bruises, Strong Voices: Lived Experiences and Coping Mechanisms of Filipino High School Students in Bullying Contexts. *Perspectives in Sustainable Development Studies*, 1(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.65401/689390>
- Anggraeni, S., Suriansyah, A., & Purwanti, R. (2025). Tantangan dan Strategi Implementasi Kebijakan Anti-Bullying di Lingkungan Sekolah SMAN 1 Panyipatan. *Jurnal Visionary Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Di Bidang Administrasi Pendidikan*, 13(2), 225–231. <https://doi.org/10.33394/vis.v13i2.16488>
- Batool, M., Gul, H., & Qayyum, R. (2025). The Effect of Bullying on Psychological Distress among University Students: A Study on Prevalence, Impact, and Gender Dynamics. *Research Journal for Social Affairs*, 3(6), 1037–1044. <https://doi.org/10.71317/rjsa.003.06.0548>
- Batool, M., Gul, H., & Qayyum, R. (2025). The Effect of Bullying on Psychological Distress among University Students: A Study on Prevalence, Impact, and Gender Dynamics. *Research Journal for Social Affairs*, 3(6), 1037–1044. <https://doi.org/10.71317/rjsa.003.06.0548>
- Bauman, S., Rigby, K., & Hoppa, K. (2008). US teachers' and school counsellors' strategies for handling school bullying incidents. *Educational Psychology*, 28(7), 837–856. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410802379085>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D.. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Goodness, K. H. (2025). Strategic Leadership for Safer Schools: The Role of School Management Teams in Enforcing Discipline Through Anti-Bullying Policies. *Science of Law*, 2025(3), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.55284/963b7468>

- Gordoncillo, H. J. (2025). Teachers' Roles on Anti-Bullying Policy Implementation: For Learners' Well Being. *Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 47(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.470110>
- Gordoncillo, H. J. (2025). Teachers' Roles on Anti-Bullying Policy Implementation: For Learners' Well Being. *Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 47(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.470110>
- Liu, X., Zhang, L., Wu, Y., You, X., Wang, Y., & Su, X. (2025). The impact of school bullying on the mental health of boarding secondary school students: the mediating roles of school belongingness and resilience. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-025-00887-4>
- Nacua, M. F. (2025). "It Should Not Be Normal": Learners' Experiences, School's Response, and a Contextualized Anti-Bullying Framework in Rural Cebu. *Psychology and Education A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 48(9), 1405–1420. <https://doi.org/10.70838/pemj.480907>
- Ocupa-Cabrera, H. G., & Cajavilca-Lagos, W. O. (2026). Bullying and Emotional Distress in Students: A Systematic Review of Prevention Strategies. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 16(2), 490–490. <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2026-0308>
- SANOPAO, J. L. (2025). Mitigating Measures in Addressing Bullying Among Learners. In Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). European Organization for Nuclear Research. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18124134>
- SANOPAO, J. L. (2025a). Mitigating Measures in Addressing Bullying Among Learners. In Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research). European Organization for Nuclear Research. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18124135>
- Tulenbaevna, M. M., Atmaca, T., Tursynkyzy, A. K., Mamadaliyev, S., & Zholdasovna, K. Z. (2025). Collaborative roles in schoolwide bullying prevention: teachers', psychologists', and school principals' shared responsibilities. *Frontiers in Education*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2025.1677350>
- Vandetta, T. (2025). A Study of Teachers' Perception Towards Bullying Behavior in A High School District. In NSUWorks (Nova Southeastern University). Nova Southeastern University. https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1829&context=fse_etd
- Vandetta, T. (2025). A Study of Teachers' Perception Towards Bullying Behavior in A High School District. In NSUWorks (Nova Southeastern University). Nova Southeastern University. https://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1829&context=fse_etd
- Zahrani, Y. (2024). Systematic Literature Review: The Effects of Bullying on Students. *King Khalid University Journal of Health Sciences*, 9(2), 80–97. https://doi.org/10.4103/kkujhs.kkujhs_12_24
- Zhang, Y., & Li, B. (2025). School Management Strategies in Preventing School Bullying. *International Journal of Sociologies and Anthropologies Science Reviews*, 5(6), 23–36. <https://doi.org/10.60027/ijsasr.2025.7273>

APA Citation:

Sadjail, M. J., & Albani, S. E. (2026). PROMOTING A SAFE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT: ROLE OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS IN ADDRESSING BULLYING AT SULU COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY INC. AS PERCEIVED BY TEACHERS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(6), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20488202>

Corresponding author: fahadliafourteentwentytwo1422@gmail.com