



Bullying Prevalence and Classroom Management Practices: Basis for Homeroom Guidance Enhancement

Sarah Jane T. Daquioag

Graduate School, Quirino State University, Philippines, Department of Education – Quirino, Philippines

Received: 21.02.2026 | Accepted: 25.03.2026 | Published: 29.03.2026

*Corresponding Author: Sarah Jane T. Daquioag

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.19318641](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19318641)

Abstract

Review Article

This quantitative-correlational study determined the prevalence of bullying incidents and the extent of teachers' classroom management practices in selected public secondary and integrated schools in Diffun Districts I and II, Division of Quirino, School Year 2025–2026. Grade 7–10 students and homeroom advisers served as respondents, using an adapted survey questionnaire to measure four forms of bullying: verbal and physical. The results showed that teachers and students often observed all four forms of bullying in the classroom, indicating that bullying remains a common and recurring feature of school life. Social/relational and cyberbullying, including exclusion, gossip, online shaming, and hurtful digital communication, were frequently experienced, while physical and verbal bullying also obtained mean ratings within the “often observed” range. Teachers likewise reported that preventive routines, vigilant incident monitoring, and restorative practices were often implemented, reflecting active but still partially realized efforts to manage bullying. Correlational findings revealed that higher classroom management practice levels were associated with greater teacher awareness and lower student-reported cyberbullying, yet showed no significant relationship with student-reported verbal, physical, and social/relational bullying, suggesting limited impact on traditional forms of aggression. Teachers strongly agreed that curriculum overload, limited homeroom guidance time, inadequate materials, and lack of specialized training constrained full integration of anti-bullying education. The study concludes that multi-component classroom management practices must be intensified and systematized to more effectively reduce bullying and that a supplementary Homeroom Guidance enhancement training program, anchored on DepEd policies and Olweus Bullying Prevention principles, is necessary to strengthen teachers' capacity for preventive, monitoring, and restorative interventions.

Keywords: bullying prevalence, classroom management practices, preventive routines, incident monitoring, restorative practices.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Introduction

Bullying significantly disrupts teaching and learning by threatening students' safety, social adjustment, and academic performance, with verbal bullying being the most common form experienced by

learners in Philippine public schools (Sansait, J., Aguilin-Saldaña, G., & Retiracion, P. 2023). In Philippine public schools, overcrowded classrooms and diverse learner backgrounds make it harder for teachers to monitor interactions and respond promptly to students' concerns. Learners commonly



experience verbal, physical, social or relational, and cyberbullying, which repeatedly harm and create unequal power between those who bully and their targets.

DepEd has issued child protection and anti-bullying policies and institutionalized Homeroom Guidance (HG) as a proactive program to build learners’ socio-emotional and negotiation strategies. However, gaps remain in the consistent use of HG and in teachers’ capacity to integrate anti-bullying content into their daily practice. Classroom management practices, including preventive routines, incident monitoring, and restorative strategies, play a vital role in reducing bullying; however, teachers often rely on reactive responses due to workload and limited training.

In the Diffun Districts I and II, local data are collected to determine how frequently bullying incidents occur and how classroom teachers manage them. The study is conducted by describing bullying prevalence as perceived by teachers and students, assessing teachers’ management practices, and using the results to propose an enhanced homeroom guidance program for the Division of Quirino.

Methodology

This study employed a quantitative correlational design to study the relationship between the prevalence of bullying incidents in the classroom as perceived by 98 teachers’ respondents and 345 students’ respondents. teachers’ management practices, and the specific challenges teachers

encounter in integrating anti-bullying education in the 11 public integrated and high schools, grades 7 to 10, in Diffun Districts I and II of School Year 2025-2026. Stratified random sampling was used to select these respondents.

Data was collected using an adapted and modified structured 83-item teachers’ survey questionnaire divided into three parts: prevalence of bullying incidents in the classroom as perceived by teachers, level of teachers’ management practice in addressing bullying, and teachers' challenges in integrating anti-bullying education in homeroom guidance. A 40-item student survey questionnaire for students to determine the prevalence of bullying incidents in the classroom as perceived by students, which comprises 4 sub-components: verbal, physical, social/relational, and cyber, lifted from Papaya-Credo (2025).

The survey instrument was distributed through printed copies in mountainous areas where there is potentially limited internet access and through Google Forms to maximize accessibility and convenience. Data analysis involved Cronbach’s alpha values, weighted means, standard deviations, and Pearson's r correlation. These statistical tools aimed to determine the prevalence of bullying in the classroom as perceived by teachers and students, the level of teachers’ management practices, and the challenges teachers encounter in integrating anti-bullying education. Ethical considerations, including informed consent and confidentiality, were observed throughout the research process.

Results and Discussions

Table 1. Frequency of Teacher-Respondents’ Observance of the Prevalence of Bullying Incidents in the Classroom

Bullying Form	Grand Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Verbal	2.74	0.83	Often Observed
Physical	2.84	0.86	Often Observed
Social/Relation	2.85	0.85	Often Observed
Cyber	2.74	0.85	Often Observed

*Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always Observed (AO),
2.50 – 3.24 Often Observed (OO),*

1.75 – 2.49 *Sometimes Observed (SO)*,
 1.00 – 1.74 *Never Observed (NO)*

The table presents the frequency of teacher-reported observations of different bullying forms in the classroom, with mean scores ranging from 2.74 to 2.85 on an unspecified scale. Social/relational bullying (mean = 2.85, SD = 0.85) and physical bullying (mean = 2.84, SD = 0.86) were observed slightly more frequently than verbal and cyberbullying (both means = 2.74, SD ≈ 0.83–0.85).

These findings align with research indicating that social and physical bullying are commonly reported by teachers as prevalent forms in school settings, often more noticeable than cyberbullying, which may be less visible in classrooms (Alsaleem, M. et al., 2021). The relatively close means suggest all

forms are present, but social/relational and physical Bullying might require particular attention due to its higher observed frequency. Given the standard deviations, there is moderate variability in teacher observations, reflecting differences in individual classroom experiences or reporting sensitivity (Siddiqui, S., & Schultze-Krumbholz, A.). (2023).

Overall, these results underscore the importance of addressing multiple bullying types in prevention programs, with emphasis on social and physical forms that appear most prevalent according to teacher reports (Al-Ketbi, A. et al., 2024).

Table 2. Frequency of Student-Respondents’ Observance of the Prevalence of Bullying Incidents in the Classroom

Bullying Form	Grand Mean	Standard Deviation	Description
Verbal	2.66	0.81	Often Observed
Physical	2.54	0.91	Often Observed
Social/Relation	2.61	1.00	Often Observed
Cyber	2.52	1.10	Often Observed

*Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always Observed (AO),
 2.50 – 3.24 Often Observed (OO),
 1.75 – 2.49 Sometimes Observed (SO),
 1.00 – 1.74 Never Observed (NO)*

The table shows student-reported frequencies of different bullying forms in the classroom, with verbal bullying having the highest mean frequency (2.66, SD = 0.81), followed by social/relational (2.61, SD = 1.00), physical (2.54, SD = 0.91), and cyberbullying (2.52, SD = 1.10). Compared to teacher reports, students perceive verbal bullying as more frequent than physical and cyber forms, which aligns with findings that verbal and social bullying are commonly experienced but may be

underreported by adults, according to Al-Ketbi, A. et al. (2024). The higher standard deviations for social/relational and cyberbullying suggest greater variability in student experiences or awareness of these less overt forms (Siddiqui, S., & Schultze-Krumbholz, A.). (2023).

These results highlight the importance of addressing all bullying types in school interventions, especially verbal and social bullying that students frequently observe but may be less visible to teachers

(Shahrour, G. et al., 2020). The relatively lower mean for cyberbullying may reflect its less direct visibility in classrooms despite its recognized impact on students' well-being (Vaillancourt, T., 2021).

Overall, student perceptions emphasize the need for comprehensive anti-bullying strategies that consider both traditional and emerging forms of bullying in educational settings (Alsalem, M. et al., 2021)

Table 3. Level of Teachers' Management Practices in Addressing Bullying Incidents in the Classroom

Level of Teachers' Management Practices			
	Mean	SD	Description
Preventive Routine	2.88	.88	Often Practiced
Incident Monitoring	2.91	.90	Often Practiced
Restorative Practices	2.96	.90	Often Practiced

*Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Always Observed (AO),
 2.50 – 3.24 Often Observed (OO),
 1.75 – 2.49 Sometimes Observed (SO),
 1.00 – 1.74 Never Observed (NO)*

The table indicates that teachers frequently engage in various management practices to address bullying incidents in the classroom, with mean scores close to 3.0 across preventive routine (M=2.88), incident monitoring (M=2.91), and restorative practices (M=2.96), all described as "Often Practiced." This suggests a consistent application of strategies aimed at preventing bullying, actively monitoring incidents, and employing restorative approaches to resolve conflicts. Research supports that effective classroom management, including establishing routines and monitoring, is crucial in reducing bullying behaviors and fostering a safe learning environment Agustian, N., & Darmiyanti, A., 2025). Restorative practices,

which focus on repairing harm and promoting empathy, are increasingly recognized as beneficial in addressing bullying's social dynamics Kayıran, D. 2023). However, studies also highlight variability in teacher responses and the need for ongoing training to enhance intervention effectiveness and teacher self-efficacy Bordi, C., 2025).

Overall, these findings underscore the importance of comprehensive teacher management practices combining prevention, active monitoring, and restorative methods to effectively mitigate bullying in classrooms Baraldsnes, D., & Caravita, S). 2025; Zhang, Y., & Li, B., 2025).

Table 4. Relationship between the Level of Teachers' Classroom Management Practices and the Perceived Prevalence of Bullying Incidents by Teachers

	Level of Teachers' Management Practices								
	Preventive Routines			Incident Monitoring			Restorative Practices		
	r	p	Decision	r	p	Decision	r	p	Decision
Verbal	.218	.031	Reject Ho	.238	.018	Reject Ho	.232	.022	Reject Ho
Physical	.144	.158	Fail to reject Ho	.146	.152	Fail to reject Ho	.145	.155	Fail to reject Ho

Social/Relational	.207	.041	Reject Ho	.198	.051	Fail to reject Ho	.175	.085	Fail to reject Ho
Cyber	.304	.002	Reject Ho	.306	.002	Reject Ho	.291	.004	Reject Ho

The data reveal significant positive correlations between teachers’ management practices and the perceived prevalence of certain types of bullying. Specifically, preventive routines, incident monitoring, and restorative practices all show statistically significant relationships with verbal bullying (ranging from $r = .218$ to $.238$, $p < .05$) and cyberbullying (ranging from $r = .291$ to $.306$, $p < .01$), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis in these cases. This suggests that higher levels of these management practices are associated with greater teacher awareness or reporting of verbal and cyberbullying incidents. In contrast, physical

bullying did not show significant correlations with any management practice ($p > .05$), indicating no clear relationship in this sample. Social/relational bullying was significantly related only to preventive routines ($r = .207$, $p = .041$), while incident monitoring and restorative practices showed non-significant trends ($p > .05$). These findings highlight that teachers’ classroom management efforts are more strongly linked to verbal and cyber forms of bullying than to physical or social/relational types, underscoring the need for targeted strategies addressing different bullying modalities Baraldsnes, D., & Caravita, S., 2025.

Table 5. Relationship between the Level of Teachers’ Classroom Management Practices and the Perceived Prevalence of Bullying Incidents by Students

	Level of Teachers’ Management Practices								
	Preventive Routines			Incident Monitoring			Restorative Practices		
	r	p	Decision	r	p	Decision	r	p	Decision
Verbal	-.133	.192	Fail to reject Ho	-.117	.252	Fail to reject Ho	-.132	.195	Fail to reject Ho
Physical	-.129	.205	Fail to reject Ho	-.145	.155	Fail to reject Ho	-.158	.120	Fail to reject Ho
Social/Relational	-.109	.285	Fail to reject Ho	-.119	.244	Fail to reject Ho	-.150	.141	Fail to reject Ho
Cyber	-.216	.035	Reject Ho	-.207	.043	Reject Ho	-.207	.043	Reject Ho

The correlational analysis revealed that teachers’ classroom management practices were generally not significantly associated with students’ reported prevalence of verbal, physical, and social/relational bullying, as indicated by small, negative, and non-significant coefficients across preventive routines, incident monitoring, and restorative practices ($r = -.109$ to $-.158$, $p > .05$). This suggests that, within

these domains, higher levels of classroom management did not translate into statistically detectable reductions in traditional forms of bullying. By contrast, a significant, albeit low, negative correlation emerged between teachers’ management practices and students’ perceived prevalence of cyberbullying. Specifically, higher levels of preventive routines ($r = -.216$, $p = .035$), incident

monitoring ($r = -.207$, $p = .043$), and restorative practices ($r = -.207$, $p = .043$) were associated with lower levels of cyberbullying incidents as reported by students, leading to rejection of the null hypothesis for these relationships. This pattern

indicates that more consistent and systematic classroom management may be particularly effective in curbing cyberbullying, even if its impact on verbal, physical, and social/relational bullying is less evident in the present sample.

Table 6. Level of Agreement of Teacher-Respondents’ Challenges Encountered in Integrating Anti-Bullying Education into the Homeroom Guidance Curriculum

Statements	Mean	S D	Description
Lack of adequate training on anti-bullying strategies hinders integration.	3.38	.73	Strongly Agree
Insufficient teaching material, such as modules and videos, for anti-bullying topics	3.34	.76	Strongly Agree
Insufficient class time during homeroom guidance sessions	3.35	.75	Strongly Agree
Lack of engagement for students.	3.38	.73	Strongly Agree
Difficulty adapting anti-bullying content to diverse students’ backgrounds	3.39	.73	Strongly Agree
An overcrowded curriculum leaves little room for anti-bullying activities	3.45	.72	Strongly Agree
Lack of administrative support, such as no policy enforcement or funding	3.45	.72	Strongly Agree
Challenges in assessing or measuring anti-bullying learning outcomes	3.46	.71	Strongly Agree
Parental or community resistance to anti-bullying discussions	3.42	.76	Strongly Agree
Personal burnout or workload prevents thorough preparation	3.43	.73	Strongly Agree
Inadequate collaboration with counsellors or other staff	3.44	.72	Strongly Agree
Technology limitations, such as no access to online anti-bullying resources.	3.45	.73	Strongly Agree
Difficulty handling sensitive bullying incidents during sessions.	3.44	.77	Strongly Agree
Grand Mean	3.41	.70	Strongly Agree

Legend: 3.25 – 4.00 Strongly Agree (SA)
 2.50 – 3.24 Agree (A)
 1.75 – 2.49 Disagree (D)

1.00 – 1.74 Strongly Disagree (SD)

Building upon the questionnaires' findings, teachers strongly agreed that they encounter numerous challenges in integrating anti-bullying education into the Homeroom Guidance curriculum. The overall grand mean of 3.41 (SD = 0.70) indicates a high level of agreement that these barriers significantly affect implementation. Among the highest-rated challenges were an overcrowded curriculum that leaves little room for anti-bullying activities, a lack of administrative support and policy enforcement, difficulty assessing learning outcomes, parental or community resistance, personal burnout, limited collaboration with other staff, and technology constraints.

These findings revealed that, although teachers are willing and often implement various management practices, they operate within systemic constraints that limit the depth and consistency of anti-bullying instruction. Lack of sufficient training, materials, time allocation, and institutional backing; even motivated teachers may struggle to sustain comprehensive anti-bullying programs within homeroom guidance. The strong agreement on issues like workload, resource shortages, and difficulties in handling sensitive cases suggests that capacity-building and structural support at the school and division level are essential to translate classroom management practices into a fully integrated, curriculum-based antibullying framework.

Teachers face significant challenges in integrating anti-bullying education into the Homeroom Guidance curriculum, with strong agreement on issues such as lack of adequate training, insufficient teaching materials, limited class time, and difficulty adapting content to diverse student backgrounds. Additional barriers included an overcrowded curriculum, lack of administrative support and policy enforcement, challenges in assessing learning outcomes, parental or community resistance, personal burnout, limited collaboration with staff, and technology limitations (grand mean = 3.41, SD = 0.70). These systemic constraints hinder the depth

and consistency of anti-bullying instruction despite teachers' willingness to implement management practices.

Research highlights similar challenges globally, including insufficient teacher training, resource shortages, curriculum integration difficulties, and lack of institutional backing as key obstacles to effective anti-bullying programs, according to Sobry & Hadisaputra (2025), Gong (2025), and Maulida & Alam (2025). Addressing these issues requires capacity-building efforts and structural support at school and division levels to sustain comprehensive anti-bullying education (Jayanti et al., 2025; Noviyanti et al., 2025). Without such support, motivated teachers may struggle to maintain effective programs that handle sensitive bullying incidents and foster a safe school environment.

The Supplementary Homeroom Guidance Training program was developed based on the results of the study.

A supplementary Homeroom Guidance (HG) training program is justifiable if it clearly responds to the statistically significant findings of the study, especially the link between teachers' practices and cyberbullying as perceived by students. In the correlational analysis, teachers' preventive routines, incident monitoring, and restorative practices all showed significant, negative relationships with students' perceived prevalence of cyberbullying ($r \approx -.216$ to $-.207$, $p < .05$), leading to rejection of the null hypothesis for these associations.

This indicates that stronger and more systematic classroom management is associated with lower levels of student-reported cyberbullying incidents, highlighting cyberbullying as the domain where current teacher efforts appear most protective from the learners' point of view. At the same time, teachers "strongly agreed" that they face substantial challenges in integrating anti-bullying content into HG, including overcrowded curriculum, limited class time, lack of specialized training, inadequate

materials, weak administrative support, and difficulty handling sensitive bullying cases (grand mean = 3.41, SD = 0.70, all items rated “Strongly Agree”). These constraints suggest that, despite willingness and existing efforts, teachers need structured capacity-building to translate classroom management practices into a fully embedded HG-based anti-bullying program.

On this basis, a supplementary HG training program focusing on (a) strengthening preventive classroom routines, (b) enhancing systematic incident monitoring and documentation, and (c) deepening restorative responses—particularly in relation to digital behavior and cyberbullying—can be logically derived from the significant results. By aligning the training with DepEd child-protection and anti-bullying policies and drawing on the principles of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (e.g., clear anti-bullying rules, consistent adult response, regular class meetings), the program directly addresses both the empirically supported protective practices and the documented implementation gaps.

The study reveals that bullying remains a persistent part of classroom life in participating secondary and integrated schools, with verbal, physical, social/relational, and cyberbullying occurring frequently; notably, relational and cyber forms are more recurrent, highlighting less visible but harmful peer dynamics. While teachers report regularly using preventive, monitoring, and restorative strategies, these practices are not yet fully consistent or institutionalized. Correlation findings indicate that stronger classroom management is associated with greater teacher awareness and reduced cyberbullying, but shows limited impact on verbal, physical, and relational forms, suggesting a gap between teacher efforts and students’ experiences. Additionally, systemic constraints—such as curriculum overload, limited homeroom guidance time, inadequate resources, insufficient training, and weak administrative support—hinder effective integration of anti-bullying measures. Overall, the findings underscore the need for sustained, structured, and policy-aligned interventions to strengthen proactive, curriculum-embedded anti-bullying practices.

Recommendations focus on addressing the most significant challenges in integrating anti-bullying education into the homeroom guidance curriculum in the Division of Quirino. Schools should institutionalize a comprehensive classroom management framework that integrates preventive routines, incident monitoring, and restorative practices. Targeted professional development on social, relational, and cyberbullying must be prioritized, aligned with evidence-based approaches and DepEd standards. An enhanced Homeroom Guidance package embedding anti-bullying content across grade levels with structured time allocation should be implemented to ensure continuity. Systemic constraints such as curriculum overload, weak policy enforcement, and limited collaboration must be addressed through stronger administrative support, provision of resources, and recognition of teacher efforts. Schools should also strengthen partnerships with parents and communities to promote shared responsibility. Future research should incorporate qualitative and longitudinal approaches to better understand persistent bullying issues and evaluate intervention effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I sincerely thank the administrators, teachers, and learners of the participating schools in Diffun Districts I and II for their openness and cooperation throughout the conduct of this study. I am also deeply grateful to the Graduate School of Quirino State University and the Department of Education–Quirino for their guidance, encouragement, and support in completing this research on bullying prevalence and classroom management practices.

REFERENCES

- Agustian, N., & Darmiyanti, A. (2025). Mencegah bullying: peran pengelolaan kelas dalam menciptakan lingkungan aman. *Journal Innovation In Education*. <https://doi.org/10.59841/inoved.v3i3.296>.
- Al-Ketbi, A., Elkonaisi, I., Abdullahi, A., Elbarazi, I., Hamada, B., & Grivna, M. (2024).

- Bullying victimization in schools in the United Arab Emirates: A cross-sectional study. *BMC Public Health*, 24, Article 20392. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s1288902>.
- Alsaleem, M., Alhashem, H., Alsaleem, S., & Mahfouz, A. (2021). Bullying prevalence among secondary school children in Khamis Mushait City, Southwestern Saudi Arabia. *Behavioral Sciences*, 11(10), Article 134. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs11100134>
- Baraldsnes, D., & Caravita, S. (2025). The Relations of Teacher Use of Anti-bullying Components at Classroom and Individual Levels with Teacher and School Characteristics. *International Journal of Bullying Prevention*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-0240028>.
- Bordi, C., Klocek, A., Kollerová, L., & D'Urso, G. (2025). Recognizing and Combating Bullying: A Qualitative Study of Teachers' Perspectives. *World Futures*, 81, 461-498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2025.2>.
- Bullying: A Qualitative Study of Teachers' Perspectives. *World Futures*, 81, 461-498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02604027.2025.2>.
- Department of Education. (2021 *Guidelines on the implementation of the Homeroom Guidance program* (DM-OUCI-2021-346). Department of Education, Philippines.
- Gong, M. (2025). Life Education: Unlocking the New Code for Preventing School Bullying. *International Journal of Education and Humanities*. <https://doi.org/10.54097/7nnpkqa96>.
- Jayangti, J., Kamal, H., & Masri, S. (2025). Creating a Safe and Inclusive School Culture. *International Journal of Asian Education*. <https://doi.org/10.46966/ijae.v6i3.495>.
- Kayiran, D. (2023). Peer Bullying Experiences and Management Strategies of Preschool Teachers. *International e-Journal of Educational Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.31458/iejes.1336321>
- Mangwiroti, T., & Majoni, C. (2025). Management Strategies for Bullying Prevention: A Comparative Study of Secondary Schools in Bindura District, Mashonaland Central Province. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.90300297>.
- Maulida, T., & Alam, N. (2025). The School Strategies in Implementing Anti-Bullying Education and Student Protection. *Ta'allum: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*. <https://doi.org/10.21274/taalum.2025.13.1.1-19>.
- Noviyanti, N., Hartini, S., Marlina, L., & Oktarini, M. (2025). The Phenomenon of Bullying in School Environments: Strategies and Challenges. *PPSDP International Journal of Education*. <https://doi.org/10.59175/pijed.v4i1.374>.
- Olweus, D. (2013). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do* (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Sansait, J., Aguilin-Saldaña, G., & Retiracion, P. (2023). Does the type of school matter in preventing bullying? Knowledge, experience, and readiness to face bullying by students enrolled in public and private schools in the Philippines. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100530>.
- Shahrour, G., Dardas, L., Al-Khayat, A., & Al-Qasem, A. (2020). Prevalence, correlates, and experiences of school bullying among adolescents: A national study in Jordan. *School Psychology International*, 41(5), 430–453. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014303>
- Siddiqui, S., & Schultze-Krumbholz, A. (2023). Bullying prevalence in Pakistan's educational institutes: Preclusion to the

framework for a teacher-led antibullying intervention. *PLOS ONE*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284>

Sobry, M., & Hadisaputra, P. (2025). Challenges and Strategies for Implementing Anti-bullying Programs for Primary School-aged Children in Indonesia: A Narrative Literature Review. *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science*. <https://doi.org/10.56557/jogress/2025/v1>.

Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H., Krygsman, A., Farrell, A., Landon, S., & Pepler, D. (2021). School

bullying before and during COVID-19: Results from a population-based randomized design. *Aggressive behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21986>.

Zhang, Y., & Li, B. (2025). School Management Strategies in Preventing School Bullying. *International Journal of Sociologies and Anthropologies Science Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.60027/ijsasr.2025.72>