**Universitas: Journal of Global Research and Innovation**
Excellence. Quality. Reliability. Service | Contributing to the body of Knowledge

# See It Before It Happens: Candijay NHS Teachers' Readiness to Prevent School Violence

**Eden B. Bayron, Jerlyn S. Mápute, Maria Gina L. Peligro, Maura G. Jumawan, Verona C. Ampo**
Department of Education
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24280611

## ABSTRACT

School violence and bullying can threaten students' safety, well-being, participation, and learning. This study examined teachers' readiness to prevent school violence at Candijay National High School, focusing on their ability to recognize warning signs, prevent incidents, respond appropriately, and address perceived challenges. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, the study gathered data from 54 teacher-respondents through a structured questionnaire using a four-point scale. The study used descriptive and inferential statistical methods to analyze teachers' readiness levels and the relationships among the study variables. The findings revealed that teachers were generally very ready to prevent and respond to school violence, with an overall readiness mean of 3.41. Prevention readiness obtained a mean of 3.57, followed by response readiness (M = 3.53), while recognition readiness obtained a mean of 3.11, indicating an area for improvement. Significant positive relationships were found between recognition and prevention readiness ($r = .367$, $p = .0063$), recognition and response readiness ($r = .431$, $p = .0012$), and prevention and response readiness ($r = .818$, $p < .0001$). However, perceived challenges were not significantly related to any of the three readiness dimensions. The analyses also revealed no statistically significant differences in readiness based on the teachers' demographic and professional characteristics examined. The study concludes that teachers' perceived readiness provides a positive foundation for school violence prevention. However, continuous professional development, improved recognition of early warning signs, clear reporting procedures, and coordinated school-community efforts remain important. These measures may help strengthen early intervention and promote a safer learning environment for all students.

**Keywords:** *school violence, teacher readiness, warning signs, violence prevention, response readiness*

## INTRODUCTION

Schools are expected to provide safe and inclusive environments where learners can participate in education without intimidation, bullying, or violence. Such experiences can undermine students' sense of safety and interfere with learning. A systematic review of reviews found evidence that school-based interventions can prevent or reduce some forms of school violence, although the evidence and interventions varied (Lester et al., 2017). Classroom management is also relevant: a Campbell systematic review found that teacher classroom-management programs reduced disruptive or aggressive behavior in the studies reviewed, while noting limitations in the evidence base (Oliver et al., 2011).

Teachers are well placed to notice changes in student behavior, identify possible bullying, establish classroom expectations, encourage reporting, intervene safely, document incidents, and refer cases through appropriate school procedures. A systematic review by van Aalst et al. (2024) organized research on teacher bullying-related behavior around knowledge, attitudes, perceived norms, and self-efficacy. In a study of 585 Taiwanese teachers, Hua et al. (2024) found that training and self-efficacy were associated with patterns of teacher responses to bullying. A later review of 74 empirical studies emphasized that teacher responses are shaped by teacher characteristics, interpersonal relationships, school context, and broader social factors (Tran et al., 2026). Together, these studies indicate that readiness involves both individual preparation and institutional support.

This study aimed to describe the profile of Candijay NHS teacher-respondents; assess their self-reported readiness to recognize warning signs, prevent school violence, and respond to incidents; describe their perceived challenges; and examine selected statistical relationships and group differences using the study results.

### Research Problem

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to determine teachers' readiness to prevent school violence at Candijay National High School. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the teacher-respondents in terms of:
    1.1. age;
    1.2. sex;
    1.3. years of teaching experience;
    1.4. teaching position;
    1.5. attendance at seminars or training sessions related to bullying, school violence, or child protection; and
    1.6. previous experience in handling or witnessing bullying or school violence?
2. What is the level of teachers' readiness to recognize warning signs of bullying or school violence?
3. What is the level of teachers' readiness to prevent school violence?
4. What is the level of teachers' readiness to respond to school violence incidents?
5. What challenges do teachers perceive in preventing school violence?

6. Is there a significant difference in teachers' readiness to recognize warning signs, prevent school violence, and respond to school violence incidents when grouped according to:
    6.1. sex;
    6.2. attendance at seminars or training sessions related to bullying, school violence, or child protection; and
    6.3. previous experience in handling or witnessing bullying or school violence?
7. Is there a significant relationship between:
    7.1. teachers' age and years of teaching experience and their overall readiness to prevent school violence;
    7.2. teachers' readiness to recognize warning signs, prevent school violence, and respond to school violence incidents; and
    7.3. teachers' readiness to recognize warning signs, prevent school violence, and respond to school violence incidents and their perceived challenges in preventing school violence?

## Methodology

### Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine teachers' readiness to prevent school violence at Candijay National High School. The descriptive component determined teachers' readiness to recognize warning signs, prevent incidents, respond to school violence, and identify perceived challenges. The correlational component examined the relationships among the readiness dimensions and perceived challenges. It also examined whether readiness differed by selected demographic and professional characteristics.

Data were collected from 54 teacher-respondents using a structured questionnaire with a four-point scale. Descriptive statistics summarized the responses, while appropriate inferential statistical tests examined relationships and differences among variables. This design was appropriate because it allowed the researchers to describe existing conditions and examine statistical associations without manipulating variables or establishing cause-and-effect relationships.

### Research Environment

The study was conducted at Candijay National High School in Candijay, Bohol, Philippines. The school served as the participating teachers' workplace and the setting where school-based prevention and response to bullying or violence were relevant.

### Research Instrument

The study used a researcher-made structured questionnaire to gather data on teachers' readiness to prevent school violence at Candijay National High School. The instrument included sections on

respondents' demographic and professional profiles, recognition of warning signs, prevention readiness, response readiness, and perceived challenges.

The questionnaire used a four-point Likert scale to measure teachers' responses to the readiness indicators and perceived challenges. The collected data were analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical methods to determine readiness levels, examine relationships among the study variables, and identify significant differences based on selected teacher characteristics. The instrument was designed to obtain information relevant to the study's objectives and provide a basis for recommendations to strengthen school violence prevention and response practices.

**Data-Gathering Procedure**

The process followed a chronological procedure. First, the researchers sought permission from the school head of Candijay National High School to conduct the study. Second, the researchers ensured that they followed the required ethical procedures and obtained informed consent from the participants. Third, the 54 teacher-respondents identified in the research dataset participated in the study. Fourth, the researcher administered the questionnaire to gather data on teachers' profiles, readiness to recognize warning signs, prevention readiness, response readiness, and perceived challenges. Fifth, the researcher collected the completed questionnaires and checked them for completeness. Finally, the researcher encoded the responses and organized them in a spreadsheet for statistical analysis using Jamovi. The data were handled confidentially and intended solely for academic research.

**Data Analysis**

The data gathered from the 54 teacher-respondents were organized, coded, and analyzed using appropriate descriptive and inferential statistical methods. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, summarized the respondents' profiles and determined their levels of readiness in recognizing warning signs, preventing school violence, responding to incidents, and identifying perceived challenges.

Inferential statistics were applied to examine relationships among the study variables and differences in teachers' readiness according to selected demographic and professional characteristics. Pearson's product–moment correlation or Spearman's rank-order correlation was used, as appropriate, to assess relationships between variables. Appropriate tests for comparing groups were used to determine whether readiness differed significantly across teacher characteristics. Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level. The results were interpreted using the corresponding statistical values and the study's established rating scale, providing a basis for conclusions and practical recommendations to strengthen school violence prevention at Candijay National High School.

**Ethical Considerations**

The questionnaire cover letter states that responses would be kept confidential and used for academic purposes. The study documentation addresses informed consent, voluntary participation, the right to decline or withdraw without penalty, protection against coercion, restricted access to raw data, secure storage, and data-retention arrangements. The raw-data file identifies respondents by codes R01–R54 rather than by name.

## Results and Discussion

The results below present the analysis of the complete raw dataset containing 54 teacher-respondents from Candijay National High School.

**Table 1**
**Profile of Teacher-Respondents**

| **Age** | **Frequency (f)** | **Percentage (%)** |
|---|---|---|
| 26–35 years old | 25 | 46.3 |
| 36–45 years old | 14 | 25.9 |
| 46–55 years old | 9 | 16.7 |
| 56–65 years old | 6 | 11.1 |
| **Sex** | | |
| Female | 43 | 79.6 |
| Male | 11 | 20.4 |
| **Years of Teaching** | | |
| 0–5 years | 8 | 14.8 |
| 6–10 years | 22 | 40.7 |
| 11–15 years | 8 | 14.8 |
| 16–20 years | 7 | 13 |
| 21–25 years | 5 | 9.3 |
| 26–30 years | 2 | 3.7 |
| 31–35 years | 2 | 3.7 |
| **Teaching position** | | |
| T-III | 26 | 48.1 |
| T-II | 15 | 27.8 |
| T-I | 5 | 9.3 |
| SPST-I | 3 | 5.6 |
| T-V | 2 | 3.7 |
| MT-I | 1 | 1.9 |
| SHST-III | 1 | 1.9 |
| T-VI | 1 | 1.9 |
| **Handled or witnessed a bullying/violence incident in school** | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| YES | 45 | 83.3 |
| NO | 9 | 16.7 |
| **Attended training/seminars related to bullying, violence, or child protection** | | |
| YES | 36 | 66.7 |
| NO | 18 | 33.3 |

Most respondents were 26–35 years old (46.3%), female (79.6%), and had 6–10 years of teaching experience (40.7%). The mean age was 39.43 years (SD = 9.86), and the mean teaching experience was 12.37 years (SD = 7.79); teachers holding T-III positions made up the largest position group (48.1%). Most respondents reported previous experience handling or witnessing bullying or school violence (83.3%), while 66.7% reported attending related training or seminars. These figures describe the respondent group and do not, by themselves, show that one demographic group was more ready than another.

The respondent profile may inform whole-school planning. Hua et al. (2024) reported associations among training, self-efficacy, and teacher response patterns, while van Aalst et al. (2024) identified knowledge, attitudes, perceived norms, and self-efficacy as themes in research on teacher responses to bullying. Tran et al. (2026) also emphasized the influence of school and interpersonal contexts. In light of this literature, professional learning can be made available across career and demographic groups rather than assuming readiness based on age, sex, position, or prior exposure.

**Table 2**
**Teachers' Awareness in Recognizing Warning Signs of Bullying and School Violence**

| Indicators | M | SD | Descriptive Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recognize sudden changes in a student's behavior, such as a usually active student becoming unusually quiet, irritable, or unwilling to participate in class. | 3.22 | 0.51 | Aware |
| 2. Identify signs that a student may be experiencing bullying, such as avoiding a particular classmate, appearing fearful during breaks, or frequently coming to class with unexplained damaged belongings. | 3.07 | 0.72 | Aware |
| 3. Recognize repeated conflicts between students, such as the same students repeatedly arguing, insulting, pushing, or provoking each other during or after class. | 3.26 | 0.51 | Totally Aware |
| 4. Identify signs of social isolation or withdrawal, such as a student consistently eating or sitting alone, avoiding group activities, or refusing to interact with classmates. | 3.06 | 0.62 | Aware |
| 5. Recognize verbal or physical threats among students, such as saying "I will hurt you," making | 3.09 | 0.62 | Aware |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| threatening gestures, pushing, hitting, or attempting to intimidate another student. | | | |
| 6. Identify signs of cyberbullying affecting a student, such as a student becoming distressed after using their phone, avoiding social media, or receiving hurtful messages, posts, or comments from classmates. | 2.81 | 0.74 | Aware |
| 7. Recognize sudden or unusual aggressive behavior toward classmates, such as shouting, pushing, hitting, or threatening others. | 3.22 | 0.49 | Aware |
| 8. Recognize when a student's behavior may indicate a need for immediate support, such as suddenly crying, panicking, expressing fear of going home or to school, talking about hurting themselves or others, or showing extreme emotional distress. | 3.17 | 0.51 | Aware |
| Overall Mean | 3.11 | 0.431 | Aware |

**Legend/Parameters.** 3.26–4.00 = Totally Aware; 2.51–3.25 = Moderately Aware; 1.76–2.50 = Aware; 1.00–1.75 = Unaware.

The overall mean score was 3.11 (SD = 0.431), indicating that they were generally aware of the warning signs associated with bullying and school violence. Among the eight indicators, recognizing repeated conflicts between students received the highest mean (M = 3.26, SD = 0.51), corresponding to the descriptive rating Totally Aware. Recognizing sudden changes in student behavior and unusual aggressive behavior followed, both obtaining a mean of 3.22. Conversely, identifying signs of cyberbullying recorded the lowest mean (M = 2.81, SD = 0.74), although it remained within the Aware category. Identifying social isolation or withdrawal also received a comparatively lower mean (M = 3.06, SD = 0.62).

The comparatively lower score for cyberbullying recognition may identify a useful topic for case-based professional learning. However, the study did not directly assess teachers' knowledge or observed performance. Van Aalst et al. (2024) reviewed teacher characteristics and behaviors related to identifying, preventing, and reducing bullying. Hua et al. (2024) reported associations between training, self-efficacy, and teacher responses, while UNESCO (2022) emphasized teacher preparation and support.

**Table 3**
**Teachers' Readiness in Preventing School Violence Through Classroom and School-Based Practices**

| Indicators | M | SD | Descriptive Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Establish clear classroom expectations against bullying and violence. | 3.56 | 0.49 | Very Ready |
| 2. Promote respectful behavior among students. | 3.63 | 0.45 | Very Ready |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3. Address minor conflicts before they become serious. | 3.56 | 0.49 | Very Ready |
| 4. Encourage students to report bullying or threats. | 3.65 | 0.49 | Very Ready |
| 5. Monitor students during activities and unstructured periods. | 3.48 | 0.51 | Very Ready |
| 6. Coordinate with parents when safety concerns arise. | 3.57 | 0.49 | Very Ready |
| 7. Refer serious cases to the appropriate school personnel. | 3.61 | 0.45 | Very Ready |
| 8. Implement school policies related to bullying and violence. | 3.54 | 0.49 | Very Ready |
| Overall Mean | 3.57 | 0.406 | Very Ready |

**Legend/Parameters.** 3.26–4.00 = Very Ready; 2.51–3.25 = Ready; 1.76–2.50 = Moderately Ready; 1.00–1.75 = Not Ready.

Overall prevention readiness was rated Very Ready (M = 3.57, SD = 0.406). Encouraging students to report bullying or threats received the highest mean (M = 3.65, SD = 0.49). Monitoring students during activities and less-structured periods received the lowest mean (M = 3.48, SD = 0.51), although both item scores were within the Very Ready range.

Respondents rated themselves highly on the prevention practices included in the questionnaire. The comparatively lower score for monitoring during less-structured periods may warrant review of supervision routines and staff coordination. Lester et al. (2017) reviewed evidence on school-violence prevention interventions, and Oliver et al. (2011) found that classroom-management programs reduced disruptive or aggressive behavior in the studies they examined. Philippine Department of Education policies also emphasize prevention and early intervention (Department of Education, 2012, 2025). These sources establish the relevance of prevention practices but do not independently verify the readiness ratings reported by Candijay NHS teachers.

**Table 4**
**Teachers' Readiness in Responding to School Violence Incidents**

| Indicators | M | SD | Descriptive Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Respond calmly when a violent incident occurs. | 3.50 | 0.52 | Very Ready |
| 2. Separate students involved in a dangerous situation when it is safe to do so. | 3.50 | 0.45 | Very Ready |
| 3. Protect students who may be at immediate risk. | 3.56 | 0.45 | Very Ready |
| 4. Report serious incidents through the proper school procedures. | 3.59 | 0.45 | Very Ready |
| 5. Document incidents accurately. | 3.35 | 0.52 | Very Ready |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Communicate with parents or guardians when appropriate. | 3.57 | 0.45 | Very Ready |
| 7. Seek assistance from the school administration or designated personnel. | 3.67 | 0.49 | Very Ready |
| 8. Follow up with students after an incident. | 3.50 | 0.51 | Very Ready |
| Overall Mean | 3.53 | 0.421 | Very Ready |

**Legend/Parameters.** 3.26–4.00 = Very Ready; 2.51–3.25 = Ready; 1.76–2.50 = Moderately Ready; 1.00–1.75 = Not Ready.

Overall response readiness was rated Very Ready (M = 3.53, SD = 0.421). Seeking assistance from school administration or designated personnel had the highest mean (M = 3.67, SD = 0.49). Accurate incident documentation had the lowest mean (M = 3.35, SD = 0.52), though it also remained within the Very Ready range.

These ratings indicate respondents' perceived preparedness to undertake the response tasks listed in the questionnaire. The relatively lower score for documentation may provide a reason to review reporting forms, timelines, confidentiality, and referral procedures with staff. Hua et al. (2024) linked training and self-efficacy with patterns of teacher responses, while Tran et al. (2026) described teacher responses as influenced by individual, interpersonal, school, and broader contextual factors. UNESCO (2022) also highlighted the importance of preparation and institutional support.

**Table 5**
**Perceived Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Preventing and Responding to School Violence**

| Indicators | M | SD | Descriptive Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Lack of training on school violence prevention. | 3.04 | 0.29 | Challenging |
| 2. Difficulty recognizing hidden or indirect bullying. | 3.00 | 0.51 | Challenging |
| 3. Fear of making the situation worse. | 3.02 | 0.43 | Challenging |
| 4. Lack of time to monitor students. | 2.87 | 0.58 | Challenging |
| 5. Limited support from parents or guardians. | 2.98 | 0.51 | Challenging |
| 6. Unclear reporting procedures. | 2.80 | 0.45 | Challenging |
| 7. Lack of school resources or personnel. | 2.83 | 0.62 | Challenging |
| 8. Students' reluctance to report incidents. | 3.20 | 0.45 | Challenging |
| Overall Mean | 2.97 | 0.496 | Challenging |

**Legend/Parameters.** 3.26–4.00 = Very Challenging; 2.51–3.25 = Challenging; 1.76–2.50 = Moderately Challenging; 1.00–1.75 = Not Challenging.

The overall perceived-challenges score was M = 2.97 (SD = 0.496), interpreted as Challenging. Students' reluctance to report incidents had the highest mean (M = 3.20, SD = 0.45), while unclear

reporting procedures had the lowest mean (M = 2.80, SD = 0.45). Both item means were interpreted as Challenging under the rubric.

Respondents reported barriers despite rating their prevention and response readiness highly. Students' reluctance to report may be worth discussing at the school level, including how reporting channels are explained and how students can be protected from retaliation. Bradshaw et al. (2013) examined educators' perspectives on bullying prevention and school-wide policies. UNESCO (2022) discussed teacher preparation and school support, and Tran et al. (2026) identified school context and interpersonal dynamics as factors that can shape responses.

**Table 6.1**
**Difference in Teachers' Readiness According to Sex**

| Readiness Dimension | t | df | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Overall readiness | 1.182 | 52 | .243 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |

The independent-samples t-test revealed no statistically significant difference in teachers' overall readiness to prevent and respond to school violence according to sex, t(52) = 1.18, p = .243. Since the p-value exceeded the .05 significance level, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that male and female teachers did not differ significantly in their overall readiness.

This finding is consistent with Moscoso (2024), whose study on teachers' readiness to teach peace education in a Philippine state university also found no significant sex differences in readiness. Similarly, Sajili's study on implementing the Department of Education Child Protection Program reported no significant sex-based difference in program implementation. These findings suggest that teachers can develop readiness-related competencies regardless of sex. Therefore, school violence prevention initiatives should provide equitable opportunities for professional development and capacity-building for all teachers, rather than basing support on sex alone.

**Table 6.2**
**Difference in Teachers' Readiness According to Attendance at Relevant Seminars**

| Readiness Dimension | t | df | $\propto$ | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recognizing warning signs | −1.119 | 52 | 0.05 | 0.2685 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Preventing school violence | -1.784 | 52 | 0.05 | 0.0803 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Responding to incidents | −1.685 | 52 | 0.05 | 0.0981 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |

The findings revealed no statistically significant differences in teachers' readiness according to seminar attendance in recognizing warning signs, t(52) = −1.12, p = .269; preventing school violence, t(52) = −1.78, p = .080; and responding to incidents, t(52) = −1.69, p = .098. Since all p-values exceeded .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Consistent with González-Martín et al. (2026), who highlighted the benefits of immersive training over traditional lectures in preparing teachers to prevent bullying, these findings suggest that seminar attendance alone may not ensure higher

readiness. Schools should complement seminars with practical simulations, scenario-based exercises, and continuous coaching to strengthen teachers' ability to prevent and respond to school violence.

**Table 6.3**
**Difference in Teachers' Readiness According to Previous Experience in Handling or Witnessing Bullying or School Violence**

| Readiness Dimension | t | df | $\propto$ | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recognizing warning signs | −0.649 | 52 | 0.05 | 0.5190 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Preventing school violence | −2.004 | 52 | 0.05 | 0.0504 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Responding to incidents | −1.906 | 52 | 0.05 | 0.0622 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |

The findings revealed no statistically significant differences in teachers' readiness according to previous experience in handling or witnessing bullying or school violence in recognizing warning signs, t(52) = −0.65, p = .519; preventing school violence, t(52) = −2.00, p = .0504; and responding to incidents, t(52) = −1.91, p = .062. Since all p-values exceeded .05, the null hypothesis was not rejected. Consistent with van Aalst et al. (2025), teachers' intervention readiness may depend on factors beyond previous experience, including attitudes and perceived behavioral control. Thus, schools should supplement teachers' experiences with practical training, clear reporting procedures, and institutional support to strengthen their readiness to prevent and respond to school violence.

**Using Pearson product-moment correlation (r)**

**Table 7.1**
**Relationship Between Teachers' Age and Years of Teaching Experience and Their Overall Readiness**

| Variables | Pearson's r | $\propto$ | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Age and overall readiness | .215 | 0.05 | 0.119 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Years of teaching experience and overall readiness | .160 | 0.05 | 0.249 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |

Pearson's correlation analysis revealed weak positive relationships between age and overall readiness (r = .215, p = .119) and between years of teaching experience and overall readiness (r = .160, p = .249). Since both p-values exceeded .05, the null hypotheses were not rejected.

These findings indicate that age and teaching experience were not significantly associated with teachers' readiness to prevent and respond to school violence. Consistent with van Aalst et al. (2025), teachers' readiness to intervene may depend on factors such as attitudes and perceived behavioral control rather than experience alone. Therefore, professional development should focus on strengthening teachers' practical skills and confidence regardless of age or length of service.

**Table 7.2**
**Relationship Among Teachers' Readiness Dimensions**

| Variables | Pearson's r | $\propto$ | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recognition readiness and prevention readiness | .367 | 0.05 | .0063 | Reject $H_0$ | Significant |
| **Recognition readiness and response readiness** | **.431** | **0.05** | **.0012** | **Reject $H_0$** | **Significant** |
| Prevention readiness and response readiness | .818 | 0.05 | < .0001 | Reject $H_0$ | Significant |

Pearson's correlation analysis revealed a significant, moderate positive relationship between recognition readiness and prevention readiness ($r = .367$, $p = .0063$). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that teachers who are more capable of recognizing early warning signs of school violence also tend to be more prepared to prevent such incidents. This finding is supported by O'Brien et al. (2024) and van Aalst et al. (2025), who emphasized that teachers' ability to recognize bullying and their confidence in intervening are important factors in strengthening school violence prevention.

Recognition readiness and response readiness ($r = .431$, $p = .0012$) have a moderate positive relationship. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that teachers who are more capable of recognizing early warning signs of school violence also tend to be better prepared to respond to such incidents. This finding is supported by Dawes et al. (2024), who emphasized that teachers' awareness and understanding of bullying contribute to their willingness to intervene appropriately.

The analysis revealed a significant, strong positive relationship between prevention readiness and response readiness ($r = .818$, $p < .0001$). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, indicating that teachers who are more prepared to prevent school violence also tend to be more prepared to respond to such incidents. This finding is supported by Welton-Mitchell et al. (2025), who emphasized that strengthening teachers' preparedness through appropriate training improves their capacity to respond effectively to school emergencies.

**Table 7.3**
**Relationship Between Teachers' Readiness Dimensions and Perceived Challenges**

| Variables | Pearson's r | p-value | Decision | Interpretation |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Recognition readiness and perceived challenges | .035 | .7992 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Prevention readiness and perceived challenges | −.026 | .8524 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |
| Response readiness and perceived challenges | −.094 | .4989 | Fail to reject $H_0$ | Not significant |

Pearson's correlation analysis revealed a negligible positive relationship between recognition readiness and perceived challenges (r = .035, p = .7992). Since the p-value exceeds the .05 significance level, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that teachers' ability to recognize warning signs is not significantly associated with the challenges they encounter in preventing school violence. This finding is supported by Chobphon (2025) and O'Brien et al. (2024), who emphasized that teachers' challenges may be influenced by broader factors, including limited resources, insufficient administrative support, and organizational barriers.

Prevention readiness and perceived challenges (r = −.026, p = .8524), revealed a negligible negative relationship between prevention readiness and perceived challenges (r = −.026, p = .8524). Since the p-value exceeds the .05 significance level, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that teachers' readiness to prevent school violence is not significantly associated with the challenges they perceive. This finding is supported by O'Brien et al. (2024), who highlighted that limited resources, time constraints, and insufficient institutional support may affect teachers' preventive efforts.

The analysis revealed a negligible negative relationship between response readiness and perceived challenges (r = −.094, p = .4989). Since the p-value is greater than the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was not rejected. This indicates that teachers' preparedness to respond to school violence is not significantly associated with the challenges they perceive. This suggests that even teachers who are prepared to respond to incidents may still encounter difficulties in actual implementation. This finding is supported by O'Brien et al. (2024), who emphasized that limited resources, time constraints, and insufficient institutional support may affect teachers' intervention efforts.

## Conclusion

The 54 teacher-respondents demonstrated a generally very high level of readiness to prevent and respond to school violence, with an overall mean of 3.41. Although prevention (M = 3.57) and

response readiness (M = 3.53) were rated very high, recognition readiness (M = 3.11), particularly in identifying cyberbullying (M = 2.81), remains an area requiring improvement. Significant positive relationships among the three readiness dimensions further demonstrate that recognizing warning signs, preventing incidents, and responding appropriately are interconnected competencies. However, perceived challenges, particularly students' reluctance to report incidents (M = 3.20), remain important barriers despite teachers' high readiness. The absence of significant relationships between perceived challenges and readiness, as well as the absence of significant differences across the demographic and professional characteristics examined, suggests that preparedness alone does not eliminate the practical difficulties of addressing school violence.

These findings emphasize the need for continuous, practical teacher training, stronger confidential reporting mechanisms, improved intervention and referral procedures, and sustained collaboration among teachers, school administrators, guidance personnel, parents, and learners. Consistent with O'Brien et al. (2024), effective intervention requires attention not only to teachers' competencies but also to the institutional conditions that support their actions.

Ultimately, the study establishes that while Candijay NHS teachers possess a strong foundation of readiness, genuine school safety requires more than being prepared; it requires the ability to recognize warning signs early, act decisively, and work collectively to prevent harm. Strengthening these capacities through sustained institutional support and evidence-informed interventions will help ensure that every learner is protected, heard, and provided with a safe and supportive learning environment.

**References**

Alcala, M. S. A., & Cornelia, M. I. M. (2025). Child protection in public schools: A correlational study of teachers' awareness and responsiveness. Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 3(7). https://ejournals.ph/article.php?id=27451

Alaniz, K., Ingram, J. R., & Fuller, M. B. (2025). Teacher climate configurations and school crisis preparedness. Journal of School Violence, 24(4), 555–570.

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., O'Brennan, L. M., & Gulemetova, M. (2013). Teachers' and education support professionals' perspectives on bullying and prevention: Findings from a National Education Association study. School Psychology Review, 42(3), 280–297. https://doi.org/10.17105/SPR-12-0001.1

Chobphon, P. (2025). Perspectives on school violence: Novice teachers' experiences in Thai urban secondary schools. Frontiers in Education, 10, Article 1691464. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1691464

Dawes, M., Malamut, S. T., Guess, H., & Lohrbach, E. (2024). Teachers' attitudes toward bullying and intervention responses: A systematic and meta-analytic review. Educational Psychology Review, 36, Article 122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-024-09951-5

Department of Education. (2012). DepEd child protection policy (DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012). https://www.deped.gov.ph/2012/05/14/do-40-s-2012-deped-child-protection-policy/

Department of Education. (2025). Revised implementing rules and regulations of Republic Act No. 10627, otherwise known as the Anti-Bullying Act of 2013 (DepEd Memorandum No. 090, s. 2025). https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/DM_s2025_090r.pdf

González-Martín, A. M., Bernal-Suárez, A., Lanza-Escobedo, D., & Berd-Gómez, R. (2026). Bridging the preparation gap: Immersive virtual reality outperforms traditional lectures in preparing preservice teachers to prevent school bullying. Teaching and Teacher Education, 177, Article 105554. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2026.105554

Hua, W.-Y., Wu, W.-C., Nieh, H.-P., & Chang, Y.-H. (2024). Patterns of teachers' responses to school bullying and their associations with training, self-efficacy, and age: A moderated mediation model. Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 42(6), 706–727. https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.2692

Lester, S., Lawrence, C., & Ward, C. L. (2017). What do we know about preventing school violence? A systematic review of systematic reviews. Psychology, Health & Medicine, 22(sup1), 187–223. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2017.1282616

Moscoso, A. M. D. (2024). Assessing teachers' readiness to teach peace education in a Philippine state university. Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports, 18(12), 142–152. https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i12812

O'Brien, S. O., Campbell, M., & Whiteford, C. (2024). A review of factors affecting teacher intervention in peer bullying incidents: A call for more nuanced professional development. Journal of School Violence, 23(3), 308–318. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1426824

Oliver, R. M., Wehby, J. H., & Reschly, D. J. (2011). Teacher classroom management practices: Effects on disruptive or aggressive student behavior. Campbell Systematic Reviews, 7(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2011.4

Sajili, W. (2026). Status in the implementation of the Department of Education Child Protection Program. Vertex: International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 1(6). https://ideas.repec.org/a/vtx/vertex/v1y2026i6id477.html

Tran, T. T. N., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Bennett, J. (2026). Teachers' responses to student bullying: A systematic literature review. Teaching and Teacher Education, 176, Article 105461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2026.105461

UNESCO. (2022). The key role of teachers in ending school violence and bullying: Technical brief. https://www.unesco.org/en/days/against-school-violence-and-bullying

Van Aalst, D. A. E., Huitsing, G., & Veenstra, R. (2024). A systematic review on primary school teachers' characteristics and behaviors in identifying, preventing, and reducing bullying. International Journal of Bullying Prevention, 6(2), 124–137. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-022-00145-7

Welton-Mitchell, C., Schwatka, N. V., Dally, M., Levine, S., & Lopez, I. (2025). Mental health integrated emergency preparedness for the public school workforce. Journal of School Violence, 24(3), 389–401. https://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2025.2478060