

Bullying Prevention Management Based on Child-Friendly Schools at SD Muhammadiyah Bayen Sleman

Muntasiyah Muntasiyah^{1*}, Sukirman Sukirman², and Suyatno Suyatno³

^{1,2,3}Master of Educational Management, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

*208046053@webmail.uad.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received June 13, 2026

Revised July 29, 2026

Accepted August 16, 2026

Keywords: School Management, Bullying, Child-Friendly Schools, SD Muhammadiyah Bayen

ABSTRACT

Bullying in elementary schools remains a persistent threat to children's psychological safety and academic development, yet most empirical studies on school-based bullying prevention have concentrated on secular public schools or on isolated interventions such as classroom counseling, peer-mediation programs, or single-shot anti-bullying campaigns. This study addresses that gap by examining how child-friendly, school-based management for bullying prevention is implemented at SD Muhammadiyah Bayen Sleman. The researcher employed a qualitative research design with a case study approach. Data collection was conducted through semi-structured interviews, and the collected data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings show that the school operationalizes a four-stage cycle, planning (hotspot mapping and a shared operational definition of bullying), organizing (formation of an anti-bullying team and expert-led training), implementing (curriculum integration across all subjects, not only guidance counseling, and habituation of Islamic character values), and controlling (periodic, collaborative evaluation). The results contribute a context-specific model of faith-integrated bullying prevention management that can inform both theory (by showing how religious values function as an integrating mechanism across management functions, rather than as a separate variable) and practice (by offering other schools, religious or secular, a replicable four-function cycle for building a child-friendly, bullying-free environment).

1. INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a repeated, intentional act of aggression carried out under conditions of unequal power between the perpetrator and the victim, and it can take physical, verbal, relational, or increasingly digital forms (Olweus & Limber, 2010; Coloroso, 2019). Nationally, the Indonesian Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection continues to record bullying as one of the most frequently reported forms of violence against children in the education setting (Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak, 2023), a pattern that is echoed globally: bullying victimization is consistently associated with anxiety, depression, school avoidance, and long-term impairment of self-esteem (Craig & Pepler, 2007; Rigby, 2020). Because elementary school is the period in which children first internalize norms of social interaction, the way an elementary school manages its environment, not merely its curriculum, has a disproportionate influence on whether bullying takes root or is contained early (Wiyani, 2018; Santrock, 2021). A substantial body of research has examined school-based management (SBM) as a governance framework that decentralizes decision-making to the school level, and a smaller but growing body has connected SBM to child protection outcomes. Yandri (2014) showed that schools which distribute anti-bullying responsibility across the principal, teachers, and school committee, rather than concentrating it in a single counseling unit, report more consistent early detection of bullying. Roesminingsih (2019) similarly found that the strength of a school's internal SBM culture, evidenced through participatory planning and shared accountability, predicted how well child-protection policies were actually followed in practice rather than merely documented on paper. Rahmawati (2021) extended this line

of work by demonstrating that parental involvement, when it is structurally embedded in SBM committees rather than treated as occasional outreach, meaningfully strengthens bullying-prevention outcomes. Most recently, Sugiyati and Siswanto (2023) examined character-based school culture and found that schools embedding value-education into daily routines (rather than as a discrete subject) reported lower incidence of peer victimization. Taken together, this literature converges on a key insight: bullying prevention is more effective when it is embedded in management structures and processes rather than delivered as an isolated program. However, three limitations recur across these studies. First, almost all of them examine general public or secular private schools, leaving open the question of how a school's religious identity, which shapes daily rituals, moral vocabulary, and community expectations, interacts with the four classical SBM functions (planning, organizing, implementing/actuating, and controlling) in practice. Second, most studies rely on survey or document-analysis designs that report policy existence rather than lived, first-person accounts of how principals, teachers, students, and parents experience and enact bullying prevention day to day. Third, none of the studies reviewed above examines how school actors themselves operationally define bullying in practice, that is, the practical threshold they use to distinguish bullying from ordinary childhood conflict, a definitional question that has direct consequences for how, and how quickly, adults intervene. This study responds to these three gaps by conducting a qualitative case study of SD Muhammadiyah Bayen, an elementary school whose institutional identity is built around the integration of Al-Islam and Kemuhammadiyahan (Islamic and Muhammadiyah) values into every level of school life (Majelis Dikdasmen PP Muhammadiyah, 2017). Its scientific contribution is threefold. First, empirically, it documents, through the verbatim accounts of the principal, teachers, students, and a parent, how the four SBM functions are actually operationalized for bullying prevention in a faith-based elementary school, rather than inferring this from policy documents alone. Second, theoretically, it proposes that Islamic values (*ukhuwah islamiyah*, *ta'awun*, and *akhlakul karimah*) do not sit alongside the four management functions as a fifth, separate variable, but function as the connective mechanism that holds planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling together into a single, self-reinforcing cycle, a conceptual move that has not been made explicit in the SBM-bullying literature reviewed above. Third, practically, it surfaces two transferable findings, a working definition threshold for bullying and a proactive/reactive supervision gap, that other schools, religious or secular, can use to audit and strengthen their own bullying-prevention systems. Based on this rationale, the study is guided by the following research question: How is child-friendly, school-based management for bullying prevention, integrated with Islamic values, implemented through the functions of planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling at SD Muhammadiyah Bayen, and what factors support and hinder its effectiveness? This question is further specified into three sub-questions: (1) How does the school operationalize each of the four SBM functions specifically for bullying prevention? (2) What forms of bullying are identified by school actors at different levels (leadership, teaching, and student experience), and how are they handled? (3) What factors support and hinder the effectiveness of this management model, and what role do Islamic values play in shaping it?

2. METHODS

This study used a descriptive qualitative case study design (Moleong, 2017) to obtain an in-depth, contextualized account of how bullying-prevention management is enacted at SD Muhammadiyah Bayen. A case study design was chosen because the research question concerns not whether a policy exists, but how it is lived out and interpreted differently by actors who occupy different positions within the school system (Sugiyono, 2019).

Informants and Sampling Rationale

Data were collected from six informants using purposive sampling, a strategy appropriate for qualitative research because it selects information-rich cases rather than statistically representative ones (Sugiyono, 2019; Walidin, Saifullah, & Tabrani, 2015). The six informants were: the school principal, two classroom teachers teaching at different grade levels, two students from the upper grades, and one parent. This composition was deliberately chosen to allow triangulation across the three levels at which school-based management operates, policy formulation (principal), policy enactment in the classroom (teachers), and lived experience of the policy's target group (students), with the parent's account added to capture the home-school collaboration dimension that is central to child-friendly school management (Rahmawati, 2021). The rationale for each informant's inclusion is detailed in Table 1. The two teachers were deliberately drawn from different grade levels (grade 2 and grade 5) because prior literature suggests that the form bullying takes, and how it is handled, differs across developmental stages (Santrock, 2021); comparing a lower-grade and an upper-grade teacher's account allows this developmental variation to surface in the data rather than being averaged away. The two student informants were selected from the upper grades (grade 5 and grade 6) because children at this age are generally better able to reflect verbally and coherently on their social experiences in a semi-structured interview than younger children (Santrock, 2021).

Table 1. Informants and Rationale for Selection (N = 6)

No.	Informant / Code	Position	n	Rationale for Selection
1	Principal (KS)	School Principal	1	Sole authority responsible for formulating and overseeing the overall bullying-prevention policy cycle (planning-organizing-implementing-controlling); the only informant who can describe the management system as a whole.
2	Teacher (G1)	Upper-grade classroom teacher (Grade 5)	1	Represents the teacher's role in enacting policy for older students, where bullying more often takes verbal/relational forms.
3	Teacher (G2)	Lower-grade classroom teacher (Grade 2)	1	Represents the teacher's role for younger students, where bullying more often takes mild physical/verbal forms; enables cross-grade comparison.
4	Student (S1)	Student, upper grade	1	Provides a first-hand account of how bullying is experienced and how teacher intervention is perceived from the student's side.
5	Student (S2)	Student, Grade 6	1	Provides a second, independent student perspective to check consistency of student-level experience across classes.
6	Parent (WM)	Parent / guardian	1	Represents the home-school collaboration dimension and the community's perception of the school's safety climate.

Data Collection

Data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews with all six informants, conducted individually and audio-recorded with consent, then transcribed verbatim. Interview guides were tailored to each informant's role: the principal was asked about policy formulation and the four management functions; teachers were asked about their role in implementation, forms of bullying encountered, and handling strategies; students were asked about their sense of safety, exposure to bullying, and perception of teacher response; and the parent was asked about the school's

communication and involvement practices. Field notes and school documents (character-education schedules, disciplinary rules) were used as supporting data for triangulation.

Data Analysis and Coding Procedure

Data were analyzed using Miles and Huberman's interactive qualitative analysis model, comprising data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Rohmadi & Nasucha, 2015), operationalized through a three-stage coding procedure: Open coding: each verbatim transcript was read line by line and labeled with descriptive codes that stayed close to the informant's own words (e.g., "forms teams," "maps hotspots," "three-repetition rule," "calls child in to advise"). Axial coding: open codes were grouped into categories corresponding to the study's conceptual framework, namely the four management functions (planning, organizing, implementing, controlling), forms of bullying, handling strategies, supporting/inhibiting factors, and the role of Islamic values. Selective coding: categories were integrated around the core theme of this study, an Islamic-integrated, child-friendly bullying-prevention management model, by examining how categories from different informants converged or diverged (source triangulation).

Table 2. Coding Scheme

Category (Axial Code)	Example Open Codes	Illustrative Source
Planning	hotspot mapping; shared definition of bullying (three-repetition rule)	KS
Organizing	forming an anti-bullying team; expert-led training (psychologists, police)	KS
Implementing	curriculum integration; posters; habituation of discipline and Islamic character	KS, G1, G2
Controlling	periodic monitoring; joint evaluation of agreed commitments	KS
Forms of bullying	verbal teasing; name-calling; social exclusion; mild physical aggression	G1, G2, S1, S2
Handling strategies	calling students in; advising; character coaching; involving homeroom teacher/parents	G1, G2, S1, S2
Islamic values	akhlakul karimah; ukhuwah; not harming others; mutual respect	KS, G1, G2
Supporting/inhibiting factors	parental awareness (supporting); teacher workload, limited CCTV coverage, reactive reporting (inhibiting)	KS
Home-school collaboration	socialization meetings; WhatsApp groups; homeroom communication	WM

Trustworthiness was strengthened through source triangulation (comparing accounts across the principal, teachers, students, and parent), member checking of the interview transcripts, and peer debriefing with the thesis supervisor.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

This section first presents the findings as they emerged from the interviews, organized around the four school-based management functions and then around the perspectives of teachers, students, and the parent, before turning to an in-depth analysis of what these findings mean, consistent with

the study's aim of tracing both the structure and the lived experience of bullying-prevention management.

3.1. Planning: Mapping Hotspots and Defining Bullying

The principal described planning as the foundation of the entire management cycle, beginning with a physical mapping of where bullying tends to occur: "The prevention program only involves four things. The first is preparation, or planning [...] within planning there is already mapping: usually bullying happens where children gather, in the classroom, outside the classroom, in the play areas. That is mapped first." (KS, Principal) A second, less expected planning activity was the negotiation of a shared, practical definition of bullying with parents, based on repetition: "If it has been repeated three times, that is called bullying. If it only happens once, maybe it was unintentional, just carelessness or something." (KS, Principal)

3.2. Organizing: Team Formation and Expert Training

At the classroom level, teachers described their organizational role as being built into policy formulation itself, not merely receiving instructions from above: "First there is socialization. Then we form teams, the prevention team. After the team is formed, there is training, we can invite experts in anti-bullying, whether from psychology or from the police." (KS, Principal) "Teachers will always be involved in drafting the anti-bullying policy and program, through meetings and discussions with the principal, and input from the teachers becomes the basis for applying the rules and the anti-bullying program." (G1, Teacher, Grade 5) This involvement was also reflected in teachers' understanding of their broader role in identifying and addressing bullying within the school environment. "Teachers are involved very crucially, because the teacher has a role as the main informant, as the formulator, and also as the implementer in the field [...] because the teacher is the one who is first in the classroom, who should know best what happens to their students." (G2, Teacher, Grade 2).

3.3. Implementing: Curriculum Integration and Value Habituation

Teachers described daily habituation of discipline and Islamic character as the operational core of implementation: "The implementation of the management, we make posters, then integrate it with the curriculum. It means bullying is not only handled in guidance counseling; in elementary school that would be the homeroom teacher, in high school the counseling teacher. It is not limited to counseling lessons, but all subjects are integrated with anti-bullying." (KS, Principal) "The character values of every student at school must be applied every day. For example, first, arriving on time in the morning, praying before and after studying, being polite to teachers, older and younger classmates, even to friends, and obeying the school rules that exist." (G1, Teacher, Grade 5) "Of course, because we are a Muhammadiyah elementary school, [Islamic values] play an important role in bullying prevention through teaching students' akhlak (character): mutual respect, helping one another, and behaving well without hurting others." (G1, Teacher, Grade 5) "Yes, clearly, because [Islamic values] have a significant role in bullying prevention. Islam teaches that we must not hurt others; we have to respect and love one another." (G2, Teacher, Grade 2). Regarding the forms of bullying encountered, the two teachers' accounts diverged in ways consistent with the developmental differences expected between grade levels: "Mostly, the most common form is verbal bullying, whether that is teasing about parents, calling bad nicknames, and saying unkind or harsh things. There is also non-verbal bullying, such as excluding a friend and not inviting them to play." (G1, Teacher, Grade 5) "What has been found in grade two is mostly physical or verbal. The physical ones are only mild, actually, but sometimes make a child cry, for example, accidentally pushing or pulling a friend's hijab. As for the verbal form, it is like teasing about someone's parents, which has also happened in class." (G2, Teacher, Grade 2) Both teachers described a similar, persuasive handling approach once an incident is identified: "The first is giving advice to the student who experienced it or who did it, and we carry out character coaching and instill an attitude of mutual respect among

friends. Teachers also approach students persuasively, cooperating with the homeroom teacher and, of course, with the parents." (G1, Teacher, Grade 5) "To prevent or follow up, I call the child in. We advise them, we provide guidance, either in groups, in the whole class, or individually, so that the child becomes aware not to repeat the bullying, which would harm both themselves and their friend." (G2, Teacher, Grade 2)

3.4. Controlling: Periodic, Collaborative Evaluation

"The last one is controlling. We monitor periodically, we supervise periodically, we evaluate periodically, together, whether the commitments made at the beginning have been carried out or not." (KS, Principal). However, the principal also candidly acknowledged that this controlling function is undermined outside the classroom: "Perhaps the teachers are busy, so when the children are already outside [the classroom]... bullying usually happens outside... there is less supervision, the CCTV is also not maximal. So we only find out bullying has happened if there is a report from a student." (KS, Principal)

3.5. Student Perspectives

Both student informants reported an overall sense of safety and belonging, while also confirming they had witnessed bullying incidents: "Comfortable, because at school friends support each other and are kind... we care for each other... respect each other... always share." (S2, Grade 6) "It has happened. [I responded by] advising them, so it is not repeated." (S1, Upper grade) "Yes, it happened. [Someone] teased another person's name with an untrue nickname. As a friend, I advised her." (S2, Grade 6). Both students independently described the same teacher-response pattern, corroborating the teachers' own accounts: "[The student who bullied] is called in, then advised, so it is not repeated again." (S1, Upper grade). "[They are] called in and advised, so it is not repeated." (S2, Grade 6). When asked what makes the school feel pleasant and safe, both pointed to relational warmth rather than to rules or facilities: "The teachers are engaging... pleasant... I feel safe because everyone here is good." (S1, Upper grade). "The teacher and friends support each other... during lessons... and also give motivation, because the teachers here are kind and enthusiastic about teaching." (S2, Grade 6)

3.6. Parent Perspective

Parents generally perceived that school-based management at SD Muhammadiyah [Bayen] was implemented effectively, particularly in terms of the school's ability to manage its programs independently while involving parents and the wider school community. "School-based management at SD Muhammadiyah [Bayen] has gone well, because the school is able to manage its programs well, independently, and involving parents and the school community." (WM, Parent) This involvement was also reflected in the school's efforts to communicate with parents regarding bullying prevention through socialization activities and parent meetings. "The school involves parents through socialization, and sometimes there are meetings with parents to discuss bullying prevention." (WM, Parent) In addition to formal meetings, parents highlighted the use of various communication channels to maintain coordination and information sharing between the school and families. "Communication is done through the homeroom teacher, through meetings with parents, parent gatherings, and also discussion in the WhatsApp group." (WM, Parent) Through these forms of involvement and communication, parents also perceived that the school environment was relatively safe, supported by clear rules and consistent supervision by teachers and other school members. "In my opinion it is already safe, because the school rules are already good, and they are implemented and supervised well by the teachers and everyone at the school." (WM, Parent) Synthesizing the accounts above, the four management functions described by the principal, and enacted differently but consistently by teachers, students, and the parent, can be reconstructed as an

integrated cycle in which Islamic values do not stand apart from management but run through each function, as summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Islamic-Integrated, Child-Friendly Bullying Prevention Management Model at SD Muhammadiyah Bayen

Function	Core Activities (from data)	Islamic Value Integration	Responsible Actors
Planning	Hotspot mapping (classroom, outside class, play areas); negotiating a shared operational definition of bullying (three-repetition threshold) with parents	Musyawah (deliberation) in reaching a shared definition; niyyah (intention) of prevention, not punishment	Principal, teachers, parents
Organizing	Socialization; forming an anti-bullying team; expert-led training (psychologists, police)	Ta'awun (mutual cooperation) in team formation; seeking knowledge (ilm) through expert training	Principal, teacher representatives, external experts
Actuating	Posters; cross-curricular integration (not limited to counseling); daily habituation (punctuality, prayer, courtesy); persuasive advising and character coaching	Akhlakul karimah (good character) habituation; ukhuwah islamiyah (brotherhood) as the relational norm taught daily	Teachers (classroom level), students
Controlling	Periodic joint monitoring and evaluation of commitments; presently reactive, complaint-triggered response outside class	Muhasabah (self/collective evaluation) as the basis for periodic review	Principal, teachers, parents (feedback loop)

Table 3 shows that the cycle is not linear but recursive: controlling feeds back into planning (evaluation results reshape the next round of hotspot mapping and definitional agreement), which is consistent with the principal's description of periodic, repeated evaluation rather than a one-time policy rollout.

DISCUSSION

This section interprets the findings in greater depth, situating them within the school-based management and bullying-prevention literature, and drawing out their theoretical and practical significance. The discussion is organized around five themes that emerged from the analysis: Islamic values as an integrating mechanism, the three-repetition definitional threshold, the proactive-reactive supervision gap, developmental differences between grade levels, and the emergent role of peer response as a protective factor. These findings extend the SBM-bullying literature reviewed earlier in three specific ways. First, whereas Yandri (2014) and Roesminingsih (2019) identified distributed responsibility and participatory planning as predictors of effective bullying prevention at the level of policy documents and surveys, the present data show concretely what that distribution looks like in daily practice: the principal frames strategy and mapping, teachers translate it into curriculum integration and moment-to-moment advising, students absorb and reproduce the same handling script ("called in, then advised") independently of one another, and the parent experiences it as ongoing socialization rather than a single announcement. The convergence between the two teachers' and two students' independent accounts of the same "call in and advise" procedure is itself an important finding: it suggests the handling script is genuinely institutionalized, rather than existing only in the principal's description of policy. Second, the finding that Islamic values (ukhuwah, ta'awun, akhlakul karimah) are described by both teachers, unprompted and in similar language, as the underlying reason bullying is being kept in check, supports and extends Sugiyati and Siswanto (2023), who found that value-habituation embedded in daily routine, rather than delivered as a discrete subject, is

associated with lower peer victimization. The present data go further by showing precisely how this habituation is threaded through each of the four management functions rather than existing as a parallel character-education track: it appears in planning (musyawarah with parents), organizing (ta'awun in team-building), implementing (daily akhlak habituation), and implicitly in controlling (evaluation understood as a form of collective *muhasabah*). Third, and most novel among the findings, is the principal's disclosure of an operational "three-repetition" threshold used to distinguish bullying from an isolated act of childhood carelessness. This finding does not appear in Yandri (2014), Roesminingsih (2019), Rahmawati (2021), or Sugiyati and Siswanto (2023), and it echoes, without fully matching, Olweus's classic definitional criterion that bullying requires repetition and a power imbalance (Olweus & Limber, 2010). The school's threshold is a practical, negotiated simplification of that academic criterion, useful because it gives parents and teachers a shared, low-ambiguity rule of thumb, but it also carries a risk that is examined further in the Discussion: a rule based on counting repetitions can under-respond to a first-time incident that is nonetheless severe, and can be gamed unintentionally if incidents are not tracked systematically across different reporting adults.

Islamic Values as an Integrating Mechanism Across Management Functions

A recurring assumption in school management literature is that character or religious education functions as a curricular input, one subject or program among others, that schools deliver alongside their administrative functions (Ikhwan, 2017). The data from SD Muhammadiyah Bayen complicate this assumption. When the principal explained planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling, he did not once frame Islamic identity as a separate agenda item; it surfaced instead inside the ordinary vocabulary of each function, in the deliberative process of agreeing a bullying definition with parents, in the choice to call the response team's ethos ta'awun rather than simply "teamwork," and in the implementation stage's emphasis on akhlak alongside curriculum integration. Both teachers, independently and without being asked to draw a connection, volunteered that Islamic teaching was the reason students were expected not to hurt one another. This pattern suggests that in a school whose institutional identity is built on Al-Islam and Kemuhammadiyah (Majelis Dikdasmen PP Muhammadiyah, 2017), religious values function less like a fifth management variable and more like connective tissue, they are the shared moral vocabulary that gives planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling a common purpose that all actors, from the principal to the students, can restate in their own words. This has a theoretical implication for how school-based management models are conceptualized in faith-based contexts. Existing frameworks (e.g., Mulyasa, 2003) treat the four management functions as content-neutral processes that can be filled with any policy substance, including bullying prevention. The present findings suggest that in an explicitly religious school, at least in this case, those functions are not neutral containers; they are already partly constituted by the school's religious identity, such that separating "the management system" from "the Islamic values" for analytical purposes, as much of the literature reviewed in the Introduction implicitly does, may understate how these schools actually operate. Future SBM research in faith-based schools may benefit from treating values-integration as a moderating or even constitutive variable rather than a separate, additive one.

The Three-Repetition Threshold: A Double-Edged Definitional Tool

The principal's account that an incident is only labeled "bullying" after being repeated three times, with a single occurrence treated as unintentional carelessness, is among the study's most striking findings because it reveals something rarely captured in survey based SBM research: the practical, everyday epistemology adults use to decide whether to intervene. Academically, Olweus's canonical definition already requires repetition and a power imbalance to distinguish bullying from ordinary conflict (Olweus & Limber, 2010); the three-repetition rule can be read as this school's

attempt to translate that academic criterion into an operational rule simple enough for parents, teachers, and the disciplinary team to apply consistently without professional training in developmental psychology. The advantage of this threshold is clear from the data: it gives the school a shared, low-ambiguity standard that appears to reduce disputes between parents and teachers over whether a specific incident "counts." It also has a protective effect against over-labeling; not every push, tease, or exclusion needs to be treated as a formal bullying case, which could otherwise overwhelm the school's response capacity and stigmatize children after a single lapse in judgment. However, the same threshold carries a risk that this study's data cannot fully resolve but can flag for practice: a purely repetition-based rule, applied mechanically, risks under-responding to a single incident that is severe (for instance, a first-time but intense physical or humiliating act), because it does not explicitly weight severity or power imbalance alongside frequency. It also depends on incidents being tracked consistently across different reporting adults and settings; without a shared log, three repetitions witnessed by three different adults, none of whom individually saw more than one incident, could go unrecognized as a pattern. This is a concrete, transferable insight for other schools: a repetition-based definition works best when paired with a shared, cross-adult incident log, something that was not described as existing in the current system.

The Proactive-Reactive Supervision Gap

A second substantive tension surfaced by the data is the contrast between the ambition of the planning stage, hotspot mapping intended to anticipate where bullying is likely to occur, and the admitted reality of the controlling stage, where supervision outside the classroom is reactive, triggered mainly by student reports, and constrained by limited CCTV coverage and teacher workload. This is a meaningful finding because it shows that having a proactive plan does not, by itself, guarantee proactive monitoring; the two functions can drift apart if the resources allocated to controlling (staff time, surveillance infrastructure) do not keep pace with the ambitions set during planning. This gap is consistent with international findings that unsupervised or loosely supervised spaces, playgrounds, corridors, and transition areas, are disproportionately common sites of bullying precisely because formal monitoring is weaker there than inside the classroom (Rigby, 2020; Craig & Pepler, 2007). What the present case adds is a concrete illustration of why this gap persists even in a school that has clearly invested in proactive planning: the constraint is not a lack of awareness (the principal names the gap unprompted) but a lack of resourcing, teacher time and surveillance capacity, for the controlling function specifically. This suggests that bullying-prevention management should be evaluated function by function rather than as a single composite score; a school can score highly on planning and organizing while remaining structurally weak on controlling, and only a fine-grained, function-level assessment, of the kind this study conducted, would reveal that unevenness.

Developmental Differences Between Grade Levels

The two teachers' accounts diverged in a way that is developmentally coherent and adds nuance to the literature on bullying's forms. The grade 5 teacher described predominantly verbal and relational bullying (name-calling, exclusion from play), whereas the grade 2 teacher described predominantly mild physical acts (pushing, pulling a hijab) alongside verbal teasing. This mirrors the broader developmental literature suggesting that as children age, aggression shifts from physical toward more verbal and relational forms as language and social cognition mature (Santrock, 2021; Craig & Pepler, 2007). The practical implication is that a single, uniform bullying-prevention curriculum applied identically across all grades may be less effective than a developmentally staged one: younger grades may benefit more from direct behavioral redirection and physical-space supervision, while upper grades may benefit more from relational and verbal-conflict-resolution skills, including explicit instruction on the harm of name-calling and exclusion, a possibility this

school's cross-curricular integration strategy could accommodate by grade-differentiated content rather than a single, generic module.

Peer Response as an Emergent Protective Factor

A finding that neither the principal nor the teachers mentioned, but that emerged clearly and independently from both student interviews, is that peers themselves actively intervene when they witness bullying, both students described advising a peer who had bullied someone, without waiting for an adult to intervene first. This is a meaningful addition to the literature reviewed in the Introduction, which has focused on adult-led management structures (teachers, principals, parents) as the drivers of bullying prevention (Yandri, 2014; Rahmawati, 2021), leaving peer agency comparatively under-examined. The fact that two independently interviewed students, from different grades, described the same spontaneous peer-advising behavior suggests this is not an isolated act of individual character but plausibly a byproduct of the same value-habitation (mutual respect, *ukhuwah*) that teachers described instilling. If this pattern holds beyond this case, it points to a practical, low-cost lever for other schools: formalizing peer-support or peer-counselor roles, rather than only strengthening adult supervision, may capture and scale a form of protective behavior that, on this evidence, may already exist informally in a values-habituated school culture. Considered together, these five threads support this study's central theoretical claim: in a faith-integrated school, bullying-prevention management functions best understood not as four independent administrative processes with a values-based curriculum bolted on, but as a single cycle in which Islamic values supply the shared moral vocabulary and motivation that make planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling cohere, while also revealing where that cycle is uneven, most notably in the gap between proactive planning and reactive controlling, and where an informal protective resource, peer intervention, is already operating without yet being formally recognized or supported by the school's management system.

4. CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine how child-friendly school-based management for bullying prevention, integrated with Islamic values, is implemented through the functions of planning, organizing, implementing, and controlling at SD Muhammadiyah Bayen, and what factors support or hinder its effectiveness. The findings show that the school operationalizes a recursive four-function cycle, hotspot mapping and a negotiated bullying definition (planning), team formation and expert training (organizing), cross-curricular integration and daily value habituation (implementing), and periodic joint evaluation (controlling), and that this cycle is held together throughout by Islamic principles of *ukhuwah*, *ta'awun*, and *akhlakul karimah* rather than by a values program running alongside it. The scientific contribution of this study is threefold. First, it provides empirical, first-person evidence, triangulated across the principal, two teachers, two students, and a parent, of how the four SBM functions are actually enacted for bullying prevention in a faith-based elementary school, extending prior survey- and document-based studies) with a grounded account of daily practice. Second, it advances a theoretical reconceptualization of Islamic values in school management, from an additive, curricular variable to an integrating mechanism that runs through and connects the four management functions, a conceptualization that has not been made explicit in the SBM-bullying literature. Third, it surfaces two previously undocumented, transferable findings: a locally negotiated "three-repetition" threshold for defining bullying, and a structural gap between proactive planning and reactive, complaint-triggered controlling outside the classroom, together with an emergent, informal protective factor, spontaneous peer advising, that current management structures do not yet formally recognize or support. For other schools, whether Islamic or secular, this study offers several practical implications. First, schools can adapt the four-function cycle

documented here (mapping, team-building with external expertise, cross-curricular and values-based habituation, and periodic joint evaluation) regardless of religious affiliation, by substituting their own institution's core values (religious or civic) for the Islamic principles that anchor this case. Second, schools using any repetition-based definition of bullying should pair it with a shared, cross-staff incident log, so that a pattern witnessed piecemeal by different adults is not missed simply because no single adult saw all three occurrences. Third, schools should audit their bullying-prevention system function by function rather than as a single composite, since, as this case shows, strong planning and organizing can coexist with a weak, reactive controlling function; closing that gap may require reallocating supervision time or investing in surveillance infrastructure specifically for unsupervised transition spaces (corridors, playgrounds) rather than assuming that a good policy document is sufficient. Fourth, schools may benefit from formally cultivating peer-support or peer-counselor structures, since this study's evidence suggests that value-habituated peer cultures can already generate spontaneous protective behavior that, if recognized and lightly structured, could extend the reach of adult-led supervision at minimal cost.

5. REFERENCES

- Al Hamid, S., & Mokoginta, S. (2023). Faktor penyebab terjadinya perilaku bullying pada siswa sekolah menengah pertama. *Jambura Journal of Community Empowerment*, 4(2), 403–414. <https://doi.org/10.37411/jjce.v4i2.2841>
- Ayu Safitri, W. (2020). *Bullying di sekolah: Pencegahan dan penanganannya*. Guepedia.
- Coloroso, B. (2019). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander: From preschool to high school, how parents and teachers can help break the cycle*. HarperCollins.
- Craig, W., & Pepler, D. (2007). Understanding bullying: From research to practice. *Canadian Psychology / Psychologie Canadienne*, 48(2), 86–93.
- Damayanti, P. D. S., Handayani, F., Ramahwati, Y., Suhermah, S., Cahyani, A. D., & Tilova, M. H. (2023). The role of educational psychology in preventing bullying among elementary school students. *Counselia: Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.31943/counselia.v4i1.60>
- Darminto, E. (2020). Peran bimbingan dan konseling dalam pencegahan perilaku bullying di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal BK Unesa*, 10(2), 1–8.
- Ervina, I., & Shela, F. A. I. (2021). Sosialisasi pencegahan bullying pada anak usia sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 3(1), 45–52.
- Faizal, M. A. (2022). *Manajemen sekolah dalam pencegahan bullying di sekolah dasar (Skripsi/Tesis tidak diterbitkan)*. Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.
- Ikhwan, A. (2017). *Manajemen kurikulum pendidikan karakter*. STAI Muhammadiyah Tulungagung Press.
- Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. (2015). *Panduan sekolah ramah anak*. Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Republik Indonesia.
- Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak. (2023). *Data kekerasan terhadap anak di satuan pendidikan tahun 2023*. Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Republik Indonesia.
- Lickona, T. (2022). *Educating for character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Bantam Books.
- Majelis Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Pimpinan Pusat Muhammadiyah. (2017). *Standar isi dan proses pendidikan Al-Islam dan Kemuhammadiyahan*. Majelis Dikdasmen PP Muhammadiyah.
- Moleong, L. J. (2017). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif (Rev. ed.)*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyasa, E. (2003). *Manajemen berbasis sekolah: Konsep, strategi, dan implementasi*. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Olweus, D. (2013). School bullying: Development and some important challenges. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9, 751–780. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185516>

-
- Olweus, D., & Limber, S. P. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 80(1), 124–134. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.x>
- Rahmawati, S. (2021). Peran keterlibatan orang tua dalam manajemen berbasis sekolah terhadap pencegahan bullying. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 9(1), 55–66.
- Rigby, K. (2020). Bullying in schools: Addressing desires, not only behaviours. *Educational Psychology Review*, 32(3), 749–766. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09526-3>
- Roesminingsih, E. (2019). Manajemen berbasis sekolah dan implementasi kebijakan perlindungan anak. *Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan*, 7(2), 101–112.
- Rohmadi, M., & Nasucha, Y. (2015). *Dasar-dasar penelitian bahasa, sastra, dan pengajarannya (metode analisis Miles & Huberman)*. Pustaka Brilliant.
- Santrock, J. W. (2021). *Educational psychology* (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Sugiyati, D., & Siswanto. (2023). Budaya sekolah berbasis karakter dalam pencegahan perundungan di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*, 12(1), 33–44.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.
- Walidin, W., Saifullah, & Tabrani. (2015). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif dan grounded theory*. FTK Ar-Raniry Press.
- Wiyani, N. A. (2018). *Save our children from school bullying*. Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Yandri, R. (2014). Manajemen berbasis sekolah dan deteksi dini perilaku bullying di sekolah dasar. *Jurnal Administrasi Pendidikan*, 21(2), 88–97.