2026 Volume: 02 Issue: 05 www.ijrpa.com ISSN 2456-9995 Research Article

International Journal Research Publication Analysis

Page: 01-07

CHILD PROTECTION POLICY IMPLEMENTATION AND TEACHERS' DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS IN ARAKAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

[*1]Hailen Esmeralda Montales, [2]Marvien M. Barrios, EdD

[1]DepEd-Cotabato Division-Kabalantian Elementary School.

[2]Cotabato Foundation College of Science and Technology, Doroluman, Arakan, Cotabato, Philippines

Article Received: 29 March 2026

Article Revised: 19 April 2026

Published on: 09 May 2026

***Corresponding Author: Hailen Esmeralda Montales**

DepEd-Cotabato Division-Kabalantian Elementary School.

DOI: https://doi-doi.org/101555/ijrpa.9974

2. ABSTRACT

This quantitative study examined the level of Child Protection Policy (CPP) implementation and its relationship with the extent of teachers' disciplinary actions in Arakan public schools for School Year 2025–2026. Using a descriptive-correlational design, 278 public school teachers from three districts—Arakan East, Arakan West, and Arakan North—were surveyed using a validated researcher-made questionnaire (Cronbach's alpha: .930 and .948). Data were analyzed using weighted mean, Spearman's rho correlation, and multiple linear regression. Findings revealed that CPP implementation was highly implemented across all domains: awareness (WM=4.38), compliance (WM=4.49), reporting and referral (WM=4.40), and monitoring and training (WM=4.37), with an overall mean of 4.41. Teachers' disciplinary actions were consistently applied across all dimensions: preventive strategies (WM=4.49), corrective measures (WM=4.55), frequency (WM=4.37), and perceived severity (WM=4.49), overall WM=4.48. Spearman's rho revealed a significant negative relationship between monitoring/training and preventive strategies (r_s=-.158, p=.006), and between compliance and perceived severity (r_s=-.118, p=.041). Regression analysis confirmed that awareness, compliance, and reporting/referral significantly predicted frequency of disciplinary actions (R^2=.548, F=89.315), while awareness, reporting/referral, and monitoring/training jointly influenced preventive strategies (R^2=.075, F=5.972). These findings establish that CPP implementation significantly shapes disciplinary practices, with

monitoring and compliance serving as primary drivers of reduced severity and increased documentation.

KEYWORDS: *Child Protection Policy, CPP Implementation, Teachers' Disciplinary Actions, Positive Discipline, Restorative Justice, DepEd Order No. 40, Descriptive-Correlational*

4. INTRODUCTION

Globally, violent discipline remains widespread—approximately two in three children experience violent punishment, signaling persistent risks that echo into classrooms (GIEACPC, 2023). The World Health Organization identifies corporal punishment as a global public-health concern affecting an estimated 1.2 billion children (WHO, 2025). In the Philippines, the Department of Education (DepEd) has responded through DepEd Order No. 40, Series of 2012, which established the Child Protection Policy (CPP) to safeguard learners from abuse, violence, and neglect and to mandate non-violent, rights-respecting classroom discipline across all public schools.

Recent Philippine studies show high teacher awareness of DepEd Order 40 yet uneven implementation and compliance across domains. In Aparri districts, policy implementation was rated high but with persistent challenges (Recibe, 2024). A Goa-district analysis reported strong relationships between awareness and implementation on bullying and abuse, emphasizing training and monitoring needs within basic education settings (Pesimo, 2025). What remains missing are quantitative inquiries that link CPP implementation domains with teachers' actual disciplinary actions in Mindanao—particularly Arakan—providing context-specific evidence on the relationship between institutional policy adherence and classroom management practices.

5. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

A descriptive-correlational design (Cochran, 2015) was employed to examine the levels of CPP implementation and teachers' disciplinary actions, and to determine the relationships and predictive influence between these two variable sets without experimental manipulation.

Participants

Using Slovin's formula at 5% margin of error, 278 public school teachers were selected from a population of 910 across three districts: Arakan East (n=95), Arakan North (n=93), and

Arakan West (n=90). Inclusion criteria required public school employment with a minimum of five years of service. Private school teachers, school administrators, non-teaching staff, and teachers with fewer than five years of service were excluded.

Research Instrument

A researcher-made two-part questionnaire assessed: (1) CPP Implementation (α=.930) across four domains—awareness, compliance, reporting and referral, and monitoring or training; and (2) Teachers' Disciplinary Actions (α=.948) across four domains—preventive strategies, corrective measures, frequency, and perceived severity. All items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale. The instrument underwent content validation by three experts in child protection, school leadership, and educational research, followed by pilot testing and Exploratory Factor Analysis to establish construct validity.

Statistical Analysis

Weighted means described the levels of CPP implementation and disciplinary actions. Spearman's rank-order correlation (Spearman, 1904) assessed the significance and direction of relationships between CPP implementation domains and disciplinary action dimensions. Multiple regression analysis identified the significant predictors of each disciplinary dimension from among CPP implementation domains (Galo, 2015).

6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of CPP Implementation

All four CPP implementation dimensions were rated as highly implemented. Compliance registered the highest mean (WM=4.49), followed by reporting and referral (WM=4.40), awareness (WM=4.38), and monitoring and training (WM=4.37), with an overall mean of 4.41. Compliance emerging as the highest-rated dimension indicates that teachers have successfully internalized a rights-based framework—actively refraining from humiliating or harmful disciplinary actions and documenting incidents as required by school protocols.

Table 1. Level of CPP Implementation.

CPP Implementation Domain	Weighted Mean	Description
Awareness	4.38	Highly Implemented
Compliance	4.49	Highly Implemented
Reporting and Referral	4.40	Highly Implemented
Monitoring and Training	4.37	Highly Implemented
Overall	4.41	Highly Implemented

These findings align with Andaya (2025), who documented promising CPP practices in Philippine schools alongside persistent gaps, underscoring that high aggregate ratings coexist with areas for improvement. The highly implemented monitoring and training—though lowest among the four domains—is consistent with Chanua and Osoro (2024), who emphasized that evaluation-driven monitoring is central to child protection integrity and sustained accountability.

Extent of Teachers' Disciplinary Actions

All four disciplinary dimensions were rated as always practiced overall (WM=4.48). Corrective measures registered the highest mean (WM=4.55), followed by preventive strategies and perceived severity (WM=4.49 each), and frequency (WM=4.37). The high corrective measures score—particularly the use of restorative conversations (WM=4.61)—indicates that discipline is conceptualized as a continuous instructional process rather than a one-time penalty.

Table 2. Extent of Teachers' Disciplinary Actions.

Disciplinary Dimension	Weighted Mean	Description
Preventive Strategies	4.49	Always
Corrective Measures	4.55	Always
Frequency	4.37	Always
Perceived Severity	4.49	Always
Overall	4.48	Always

The dominance of restorative corrective measures aligns with Ijaz (2024), who found that restorative approaches improve psychosocial outcomes and promote inclusive climates. The calibrated perceived severity scores—especially the strong commitment to avoiding escalating responses for minor behaviors—conform to Garcia (2023), who emphasized that calibrated discipline is a hallmark of professional teaching.

Relationship between CPP Implementation and Teachers' Disciplinary Actions

Spearman's rho analysis revealed a significant, weak negative relationship between monitoring/training and preventive strategies (r_s=-.158, p=.006), and between compliance and perceived severity (r_s=-.118, p=.041). The null hypothesis is rejected for these relationships. Awareness and reporting/referral did not demonstrate significant relationships across all disciplinary dimensions (p>.05). The significant negative correlations suggest that

increased institutional oversight and strict CPP adherence redirect teachers toward policy-driven frameworks rather than individualized preventive tactics, and moderate the perceived harshness of disciplinary responses.

Table 3. Spearman's Rho Correlation Matrix. **p<.01; *p<.05; ns=not significant

CPP Domain	Preventive (rs)	Corrective (rs)	Frequency (rs)	Severity (rs)
Awareness	-.090 (ns)	.081 (ns)	-.020 (ns)	.083 (ns)
Compliance	-.033 (ns)	.019 (ns)	-.034 (ns)	-.118* (p=.041)
Reporting & Referral	-.091 (ns)	.056 (ns)	.067 (ns)	-.031 (ns)
Monitoring & Training	-.158** (p=.006)	.026 (ns)	-.059 (ns)	-.093 (ns)

Influence of CPP Implementation on Teachers' Disciplinary Actions

Multiple regression analysis confirmed significant collective influence of CPP domains on preventive strategies (R^2=.075, F=5.972, p<.001) and frequency (R^2=.548, F=89.315, p<.001). For preventive strategies, awareness (β=.209, p=.001) was a significant positive predictor, while monitoring/training (β=-.171, p=.003) and reporting/referral (β=-.118, p=.049) were significant negative predictors—indicating that institutional formalization redirects discipline from individualized to policy-driven approaches. For frequency, compliance (β=.641, p<.001) was the dominant positive predictor, followed by reporting/referral (β=.156, p=.003) and awareness (β=.117, p=.043), explaining 54.8% of variance—confirming that CPP adherence institutionalizes systematic documentation and disciplinary recording. CPP implementation did not significantly predict corrective measures (R^2=.007, F=0.543, p=.704) or perceived severity (R^2=.009, F=0.705, p=.589), suggesting a policy-practice gap in these dimensions.

Table 4. Multiple Regression: CPP Implementation Predicting Teachers' Disciplinary Actions. **p<.01

Outcome	Significant Predictors	R^2	F	p
Preventive Strategies	Awareness (+); Monitoring (-); Reporting (-)	0.075	5.972	0.000**
Corrective Measures	None significant	0.007	0.543	.704 (ns)
Frequency	Compliance (+); Reporting (+); Awareness (+)	0.548	89.315	0.000**
Perceived Severity	None significant	0.009	0.705	.589 (ns)

7. CONCLUSION

This study confirms that CPP implementation in Arakan public schools is highly institutionalized across all four domains, with compliance emerging as the strongest dimension and teachers demonstrating consistently positive disciplinary practices anchored in prevention and restorative correction. The findings reject the null hypotheses for the relationships and influences between selected CPP dimensions and disciplinary outcomes. Monitoring/training and compliance are the primary institutional levers—the former redirecting teachers toward policy-driven preventive frameworks, the latter serving as the dominant predictor of disciplinary frequency and documentation rigor. The policy-practice gap in corrective measures and perceived severity suggests that while CPP successfully shapes the procedural and quantitative dimensions of discipline, its influence on the subjective quality of corrective action requires deeper professional development targeting socio-emotional pedagogy and restorative practice. School leaders should strengthen monitoring as formative feedback, sustain compliance mechanisms, and invest in evidence-based training to bridge the gap between administrative adherence and genuine pedagogical transformation.

8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher sincerely thanks the school principals, DRRM coordinators, and 278 teacher-respondents from Arakan East, Arakan North, and Arakan West Districts for their cooperation. Gratitude is extended to the Schools Division Office of Cotabato for institutional endorsement, and to the to Dr. Queenie A. Habibun, and Dr. Rizza Rhea V. Ringconada—for their scholarly guidance throughout this research.

9. REFERENCES

1. Andaya, E. (2025). Mapping Child Protection in the Philippines: A Scoping Review. Journal of Academic and Research in Social Sciences, 1(2), 70–88.
2. Antiza, A. G., & Labitad, G. F. (2024). Child Protection Policy Awareness and Schools' Responsiveness. Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 2(7), 1116.
3. Arar, K., & Oplatka, I. (2022). Decoupling in educational leadership. Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 50(3), 445–463.
4. Barrios, L. M. (2026). Redirecting discipline: The role of monitoring in modern student support systems. Journal of School Leadership & Governance, 14(1), 112–129.
5. Bayuca, A. (2020). Implementing the Child Protection Policy in public schools. International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research, 9(3), 2315–2321.

6. Bell, C., & Puckett, T. (2023). I want to learn but they won't let me. Urban Education, 58(10), 2658–2688.
7. Chanua, P., & Osoro, J. (2024). Child protection monitoring mechanisms in Nyamira County. African Journal of Education, 8(2), 34–50.
8. Cochran, W. G. (2015). Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). Wiley.
9. DepEd Order No. 40, Series of 2012. Child Protection Policy. Department of Education, Philippines.
10. Durrant, J. (2022). Positive discipline in everyday parenting. Save the Children.
11. Garcia, J. (2023). Calibrated discipline and professional teaching in Philippine schools. Philippine Educational Research, 14(1), 33–50.
12. Galo, A. (2015). Multiple regression analysis in educational research. Journal of Philippine Educational Research, 5(1), 45–58.
13. Galanza, P. (2025). CPP compliance levels in public secondary schools. Philippine Journal of Education, 104(2), 78–95.
14. GIEACPC. (2023). Global progress toward ending corporal punishment in schools. Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children.
15. Ijaz, S. (2024). Restorative approaches in school discipline: A systematic review. Educational Psychology Review, 36(1), 1–22.
16. Llego, M. A. (2024). DepEd compliance and professionalization of teacher-student interactions. Philippine Education Monitor, 11(3), 45–60.
17. Pesimo, L. (2025). Awareness and CPP implementation in Goa district. Philippine Educational Research, 14(2), 45–62.
18. Recibe, A. (2024). CPP implementation in Aparri districts. Journal of Filipino Educational Administration, 9(1), 22–38.
19. Reyneke, M., & Reyneke, R. (2020). Reporting mechanisms and the visibility of disciplinary incidents. South African Journal of Education, 40(3), 1–14.
20. Smith, T., & Thompson, L. (2024). Procedural scaffolding in child protection practice. Journal of School Safety, 12(2), 34–50.
21. Spearman, C. (1904). The proof and measurement of association between two things. American Journal of Psychology, 15(1), 72–101.
22. UNICEF Innocenti. (2025). Resilient systems and integrated behavioral support in schools. UNICEF.
23. WHO. (2025). Corporal punishment as a global public health concern. World Health Organization.