

Parents' Understanding of Child Protection Policy: Basis for Intervention

Catherine B. Magat

Teacher III, Villacin Elementary School, Department of Education, Philippines
catherinebmagat@gmail.com, 09605900725/09486424633

Romulo T. Sisno

Mount Carmel College of Escalante, Inc., Escalante City, Negros Occidental, Philippines
romulosisno@gmail.com, 09199113092

Abstract

This study examined parents' understanding of the Child Protection Policy for Cadiz District 1, Division of Cadiz City. The researcher aptly considered the descriptive research design, incorporating quantitative data collection to identify the variables in an area of interest. A researcher-made survey questionnaire was employed, considering the mean and standard deviation statistical tools. The researcher discovered that parents are all aware of the Child Protection Policy concerning child abuse, exploitation, violence, bullying, and other forms of violations. However, parents do not fully understand what discrimination is all about. A comprehensive discussion regarding discrimination is imperative for a deeper understanding. Hence, the researcher recommends the following. (i) Schools may be encouraged to design ways and means to propagate campaigns on Child Protection Policy (ii) School heads may be encouraged to design programs and activities, and other undertakings that contribute to a deeper understanding likewise enhance Child Protection Policy awareness; and (iii) Parents may be educated and encouraged to update themselves with the new policies and guidelines regarding Child Protection Policy, especially in discrimination.

Keywords: Child Protection, Child Protection Policy, Parents' Understanding, Intervention, policies

Introduction

"A safe childhood is a human right," Gupta (2013). Every child is entitled to live in a safe environment devoid of violence, exploitation, abuse, discrimination, bullying, and other types of violations. Parents and caregivers should take child protection seriously. Family is the first line of protection. Parents or guardians should build a safe and protective home environment. The community and the schools are responsible for providing a child-friendly environment where children grow, pursue, and develop their dreams.

In the course of the COVID-19 pandemic, Social Watch Philippines reported 2,077 documented cases of violence against children during the first three months of lockdown (Manila Bulletin, 2021). Likewise, citing data from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the Department of Justice (DOJ) had cases of Online Sexual Abuse and Exploitation of Children (OSAEC) in the country. There were 279,166 cases from March to May 2020 as compared to 76,561 cases during the same period in 2019 (Inquirer.Net, 2021). The implementation of the enhanced community quarantine increased these child abuse cases.

Acknowledgment of children who are abused and neglected can be prevented by adequate follow-up, family communication, and request of guidance, monitoring (Roche, 2017), and joint effort with office support (Karadag, Sonmez, and Dereobali, 2015) and positive attitude Poreddie, Gandhi, Kathyayani, & Math, 2016). Establishment of child protection policies presents a degree of proficient skill across school associations and diminishes oppressive perspectives (Devaney, 2009). Understanding about the child protection act, Ruelo, Moneva, and Quesio (2020) is imperative to all stakeholders, teachers, staff, personnel, and (Healy, Darlington, & Feeney, 2011) parents who are in direct contact with the child. They should observe any outward signs of abuse, violence, exploitation, discrimination, bullying, and other forms of violations as displayed in the change of behaviors or stunted development.

DepEd Order Number 40, series of 2012, otherwise known as “DepEd Child Protection Policy,” provides guidelines on its implementation among public schools to protect children in schools from Abuse, Violence, Exploitation, Discrimination, Bullying, and other forms of Abuse or violations. “Child Protection policy is a commitment” Al-Qaysi, (2018) and strengthening (Sannadan, San Pedro, Velchez, & Venida, 2020) the implementation of this policy is essential therefore administrators and all others concerned should equipped themselves with a depth understanding of the policy most especially the parents or guardians who are responsible of their children’s care Bannon & Carter (2003). Hence, this study on parents’ understanding of Child Protection Policy as a basis for intervention was conducted.

Literature Review

Effects of Violations on Children

Direct accurate exposure of the learners to abuse was the most consequential determinant of the legal result in the qualitative analysis of children (Castillo, 2009). Many youths should be tested for their impassiveness, and the effect on their attitude and others (Wekerle et.al, 2009). Coincidentally, these results demonstrate the need for more structure and function in child and youth protection (Brown, 2018). Many child protection agencies can benefit from parents’ experience about the value of establishing a different relationship as a foundation for collaboration (Healy, Darlington, & Fenny, 2010).

On the other hand, some beliefs affect such as parents’ issues and inadequate resources for poor families beyond pediatric control (Bannon, 2013). Neglect of the child and the youth presents as a major factor in their health and their well-being (Hildyard & Wolfe, 2012). Sometimes, some children at the age of ten are aware of the child protection mechanism (Cossar, Brandon, and Jordan, 2014). To achieve positive results for youth at risk, child protection practices must be on continuous improvement, based on anti-discrimination values (Lachman & Bernard, 2016). Recognition of children who are abused and neglected can be prevented by sufficient follow-up, family interaction, and supplication of advice, monitoring, and collaboration with agency support (Karadag, Sonmez, & Dereobali, 2015). It would also be important to consider the more emotional side of the child who is the victim, for instance, of the culture of discrimination, so that nervousness can be understood and appropriate debriefing can lead them to tell the truth (Wittaker, 2011). Positive behavior can prevent child abuse (Poreddie et al., 2016).

Further, child and youth organizations can protect children from serious problems like child abuse (Qaysi, 2018). Child abuse related to domestic issues can also be prevented (Hartley, 2012). Likewise, the consequence of child abuse can cause low self-esteem in the youth, and the atmosphere of the child varies widely (Dahake & Kale, 2018). The creation of law can make a definite reference to protect the child, which can be possible through integration in the child’s education in schools.

Along this line, ample understanding of the child protection act and recognizing abuse are important in child protection problems (Yekta, Baherian, & Nezhad, 2011). Schools can amplify the awareness of the child. Aside from this, there are instances when the performance of the child in the classroom is affected. The Child Protection Act can contribute to children defending themselves at times when they experience violent acts that can affect their learning (Kasmawati, 2018).

On Welfare and Safety

The Child Protection Act stipulates the provisions to ascertain the welfare and safety of the child. Different agencies are working to implement the law and help the children in need. The government itself tasked the department with social welfare and services to protect the children. It is encouraged that all child protection organizations shall use structured formats, efforts, and initiatives to help out the victims in the category of abuse (Macmillan, Jamieson, & Walsh, 2013).

Likewise, the organization shall include child protection services related to those bodily and sexually abused (Estremera, 2018). In school, related policies directed to youth protection are under the teacher and school authority (Trocme et al., 2013). At home, the authority is from parents, though certain issues involving investigations, those

families who hit their children with hard materials were more noticeable, and show their children disrespect (Kenny, 2011).

Also, teachers revealed that some youths are unaware of the child protection process mentioned and feel extemporary, such as care (Papaefstathiou, Rhind, & Brackenridge, 2012). Implantation of youth protection policies presents a level of professionalism across school organizations and reduces abusive attitudes (Deyvane, 2019). However, teachers cannot implement this all by themselves because of more related functions and duties, especially when the case affecting the child's behavior in school is connected to home.

For instance, living with their parents who used alcohol would be harmful because children are put in a risky situation, and such is too domestic (Okoye, 2011). In a wider scenario, this is quite difficult, especially for children in developing and poor countries. Understanding and learning the rights of youth are growing around the world, and there is more rhetoric paid to their interest than actual compliance, especially in those countries that are still developing (Roche, 2017).

The Child Protection Act reveals that during the process of its implementation that many types of youth abuse influence the well-being of the children (Madrigal, 2018). The prosperous implementation of the youth welfare policy requires the engagement of many stakeholders in learning institutions (Ozturk & Dogan, 2017). In school, teachers should work based on the youth's rights, which have not been developed completely. Of course, teachers are not into this profession of dealing with critical matters related to child abuse.

Moreover, the family and community culture sometimes impede the implementation of a child protection act because of the fear of getting involved in legal proceedings. Teachers have not learned the appropriate means to address the needs in the implementation of child protection, as well as adapted best practices to handle related scenarios. Better and specialized practices are important to facilitate diagnosis, improve reporting, reinforce cooperation with skills, and reduce tears when dealing with youth (Fallon, Trocme, & Maclaurin, 2011). Applicable programs and strategies shall be created for vulnerable youth (Gupta & Lata, 2013).

Ruelo, Moneva, and Quesio (2020), in their study on understanding and extent of welfare and safety provisions of Child Protection Law in the Philippines- a case study, expressed that the Child Protection Act is all about giving protection to children who are experiencing maltreatment and abuse by their parents or someone. With an understanding of the Child Protection Act, children can prevent instances of child abuse and maltreatment. Protection is significant to an individual, especially children.

Concerning this, the study they have conducted used a descriptive-correlation design to determine the association between the understanding and the extent of welfare and safety of students who are involved in this study. The researchers used a checklist to collect the responses. The data collected were treated through weighted mean and chi-square. Their finding revealed that students need to learn further about the Child Protection Act.

This study is very similar to the present study in the sense that they both deal with issues of the child protection policy. However, differences in both studies can be traced to the participants they utilized. This study reflected students as participants of the study, while the present one deals with parents as participants of the study.

Zamora and Madrigal (2018) on Child Protection Policy Compliance in a Catholic Educational Institution pointed out that child protection policy is a statement of commitment of schools to safeguard children from harm and foster their holistic development and welfare. Using a sequential explanatory mixed-method design, the paper examines the extent of compliance of the Catholic educational institution in the Philippines with the Department of Education (Dep.Ed.) Order No.40 on Child Protection Policy.

The findings show that the Catholic educational institution has complied with the provisions of the child protection policy yet the personnel training and development are partially complied with. A significant difference was found in the extent of compliance of the Catholic educational institution with the child protection policy when the assessors were grouped according to their classification.

This study pointed out similarities to the present investigation. They bear similarities because both studies deal with the topic of the child protection policy, which is of concern for this Covid-19 pandemic and even more to this day. Although they are similar in the topic of concern, however, they differ with regard to the participants of their study. While the present study only deals with parents as participants of the study, this study, on the other hand, deals with school personnel and parents as well. Besides, they also differ about the locale of the study. This study focuses on Catholic schools, while the present one focuses on public elementary schools in the District I Division of Cadiz City.

Garlitos (2019), on the Level of Knowledge and Attitude of Parents On Child Protection Policy Campaign: A Basis for Program Implementation, revealed that the level of knowledge of the parents on the policy has an important connection to their attitude towards the policy implementation. Using the descriptive correlational research design, the paper examines the relationship between the parents' knowledge and their attitude towards the policy. The study emphasized the need for crafting activities for a full understanding of the Child Protection Policy to be conducted.

This study has similarities with the present study for both deal with parents as the respondents and both assessed the level of parents' knowledge. However, they differ in the locale, research design, and statistical tool used. The previous studies (Ruelo et, al., 2020) conducted agree that laws on child protection should be understood by all stakeholders, and schools' compliance with the DepEd Order Number 40, series of 2012 is observable. Moreover, training among personnel should be taken into great consideration (Zamora and Madrigal, 2018), and schools and other agencies should take responsibility to widely disseminate the CPP.

The studies differ in their research design by employing a descriptive-correlation sequential explanatory mixed-method design and descriptive correlational, respectively. This study used the descriptive-quantitative research design to determine the understanding of parents of the child protection policy stipulated in D.O. #40, s.2012. Although the previous studies and the present study differ in the locale and the respondents, this study concentrates on the public elementary schools of District I, Division of Cadiz City. Previous studies were of great help in determining the needed variables and the extent of the compliance and implementation of the policy in various localities. This suggests that a deeper understanding of the policy should be given emphasis, most especially to parents in this time of pandemic, where children are confined at home.

Methodology

Research Design

This study employed the descriptive research design. According to Siedlecki (2020), this type of research is characterized by observations or explanations of a phenomenon or a situation. This strategy does not involve influencing variables or forcing events to occur. It incorporated the non-probability, quantitative data in meeting the objective. The quantitative aspect of this study manifested itself in the form of a survey questionnaire.

Respondents. The respondents of the study were the 223 parents of the elementary pupils in District I, Division of Cadiz City. Parents were grouped according to their family income, location, highest educational attainment, and the number of children.

Sampling Technique

The study's sample size was determined using Slovin's formula, in which 223 parents emerged as the total participants of the study. A stratified random sampling technique was used to determine the number of participants for the seven (7) schools of District I. Out of 3,105 parents, 223 were included in the sampling, as reflected in the table.

Table 1
Distribution of Parent Participants by School

Schools	Population	Sample	%
School A	262	19	8.52
School B	855	61	27.35

School C	244	18	8.07
School D	199	14	6.28
School E	271	20	8.97
School F	263	19	8.52
School G	1,011	72	32.29
Total	3,105	223	100%

Data Gathering Instrument

The research instrument used in this study was researcher-made and consisted of two main parts. Part I of the research instrument determines the Profile of the parents of Cadiz District I. This includes their family income, location, highest educational attainment, and the number of children. Part II of the research instrument contains questions about the parents' understanding of the Child Protection Policy. The parents were asked to rate their understanding of the Child Protection Policy using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from "very high" to "very low," in the areas of abuse, violence, exploitation, discrimination, bullying, and other forms of violation.

Validity of the instrument

The validity of the research instrument employed in this study was tested. The researcher adopted the Critical Values for Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio (CVR). The CVR (content validity ratio), as projected by Lawshe (1975) and utilized by Taherdoost, (2016) is a linear transformation of a proportional level of agreement on how many "experts" labeled an item as "important." The research instrument was presented to the nine jurors considered experts in child education, research, and education in general to perform this type of validity. They went over the research instrument item-by-item and judged whether the items are essential, useful but not essential, or not essential. Using the Lawshe validity index, the result shows that all items included in the questionnaire were retained. The validity index generated using Lawshe was 0.93. This indicates that the instrument used had a high level of validity.

Reliability of the Research Instrument

For this test, the research instrument was subjected to analysis using Cronbach's Alpha. When the instrument has items that may not be simply right or wrong, Cronbach's Alpha is applied (Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). The test-retest reliability was conducted on the 30 parents of District III who were not the study's respondents. Using the Cronbach alpha reliability test, the result revealed that the reliability of the research instrument was very high, as shown by the obtained reliability coefficient of 0.93.

Data Gathering Procedures

Before the research was initiated, an authorization was requested from the Schools Division Superintendent of the Division of Cadiz City to conduct the study among the specified respondents. Likewise, informed consent from the parents was also considered for the conduct of the research instrument. This intention of the researcher minimized the issue of ethical consideration.

The researcher acquired data by asking for the help of selected teachers at the different schools of the district. They administered the survey during the scheduled distribution and retrieval of the modules, adhering to the minimum health protocol set by the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF).

Data Analysis

All data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation. To determine parents' understanding of the level of the Child Protection Policy, the following scales and interpretations were used:

Scale	Interpretation
4.21 – 5.00	Very High
3.41 – 4.20	High
2.61 – 3.40	Average

1.81 – 2.60
1.00 – 1.80

Low
Very Low

Results and Discussion

This section presents the statistical analysis and interpretation of quantitative data collected to address the objectives of the study. Appropriate and systematic research procedures were employed to ensure the accuracy, reliability, and validity of the data, thereby providing empirical answers to the identified research problems.

Table 2
Personal Profile of the Respondents

Personal Profile	Frequency	Percentage
Family Income		
10,000 & below	189	84.8
10,001 - 15,000	27	12.1
15,001 - 20,000	7	3.1
Total	223	100.00
Location		
Urban	123	55.2
Rural	100	44.8
Total	223	100.00
Educational Attainment		
Elementary	39	17.5
High School	124	55.6
Technical/Vocational	28	12.6
College	32	14.3
Total	223	100.00
Number of Children		
1-3 children	149	66.8
4-6 children	64	28.7
More than 6	10	4.5
Total	223	100.00

Table 2 shows the profile of the respondents. As shown in this table, 189 or 84.8% of the respondents have an income of 10,000 and below, while 27 and 7 or 21.1% and 3.1% have an income of 10,001 - 15,000 and 15,001 - 20,00. On the other hand, 123 or 55.2% are grouped in the urban areas according to their location, while 100 or 44.8% are in the rural areas. Considering educational attainment, a large percentage of the respondents, 124 or 55.6%, are high school level and graduates, while only a few are elementary and college levels and graduates. Furthermore, when grouped according to the number of children, 149 or 88.8% have 1 - 3 children, while 64 10 or 28.7% and 4.5% have 4 - 6 and more than 6 children.

Table 3
Level of Parents' Understanding of the Child Protection Policy when Taken as a Whole

Understanding	Mean	Sd	Interpretation
Abuse	3.50	1.20	High
Violence	3.65	1.19	High
Exploitation	3.51	1.21	High
Bullying	3.51	1.21	High
Discrimination	3.42	1.18	High
Other forms of Violations	3.47	1.17	High

As a Whole **3.51** **1.11** **High**

Table 3 reveals that the parents' level of understanding of child protection policy is high when taken as a whole ($M = 3.51$, $SD = 1.11$), contrary to Garlitos' (2019) findings, which is very high, and Ruelo et.al. (2020) study on moderately knowledgeable students. Likewise, the same results were noticed when understanding child protection policy was considered in terms of abuse, violence, exploitation, bullying, discrimination, and other forms of violation. Obtained means ranging from 3.42 to 3.65 at standard deviations ranging from 1.17 to 1.21, supporting these data. This denotes that parents have already understood the CPP. In addition, the parents and other stakeholders should update themselves (Ruelo, Moneva & Duesio, 2020) of D.O. #40, s. 2012 for proper implementation and guidance.

Table 4

Level of Parents' Understanding of Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to Family Income

Understanding	Family Income	Mean	Sd	Interpretation
Abuse	10,000 and below	3.46	1.23	High
	10,001-15,000	3.67	0.98	High
	15,001-20,000	3.86	1.18	High
Violence	10,000 and below	3.62	1.23	High
	10,001-15,000	3.79	0.87	High
	15,001-20,000	4.06	1.32	High
Exploitation	10,000 and below	3.48	1.24	High
	10,001-15,000	3.59	0.88	High
	15,001-20,000	3.86	1.34	High
Bullying	10,000 and below	3.46	1.23	High
	10,001-15,000	3.67	0.95	High
	15,001-20,000	4.20	0.94	High
Discrimination	10,000 and below	3.37	1.24	Average
	10,001-15,000	3.53	0.94	High
	15,001-20,000	4.17	0.82	High
Other Forms of Violations	10,000 and below	3.44	1.20	High
	10,001-15,000	3.50	0.96	High
	15,001-20,000	4.14	0.73	High
As a Whole	10,000 and below	3.47	1.20	High
	10,001-15,000	3.62	0.86	High
	15,001-20,000	4.07	1.03	High

Table 4 reflects that the level of parents' understanding of the child protection policy is high when grouped according to their monthly family income. Means of 3.47, 3.62, and 4.07 at standard deviations of 1.20, 0.86, and 1.03 supported these data. Likewise, the same results were observed when the different child protection policies were considered independently except for discrimination. The level of understanding of parents having a family income below 10,000 is average ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 1.24$).

This result suggests that they already understand the child protection policy (Garlitos 2019), even considering their monthly family income. However, in terms of discrimination, parents whose income is 10,000 or below has an average level of understanding compared to the other respondents.

Table 5

Level of Parents' Understanding of the Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to Family Location

Understanding	Location	Mean	Sd	Interpretation
Abuse	Urban	3.46	1.16	High
	Rural	3.54	1.25	High
Violence	Urban	3.69	1.13	High
	Rural	3.60	1.27	High
Exploitation	Urban	3.47	1.13	High
	Rural	3.56	1.31	High
Bullying	Urban	3.45	1.11	High
	Rural	3.59	1.31	High
Discrimination	Urban	3.33	1.11	Average
	Rural	3.53	1.23	High
Other Forms of Violations	Urban	3.46	1.11	High
	Rural	3.48	1.23	High
As a whole	Urban	3.48	1.05	High
	Rural	3.55	1.20	High

Reflected in Table 5 is the level of understanding of the child protection policy of the parents. As shown in this table, the level of understanding among parents in urban areas ($M = 3.48$, $SD = 1.05$) and Rural Areas ($M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.20$) is high. The same results are reflected when understanding child protection policy was considered individually; parents' understanding is high except for discrimination, where parents live in urban areas. Their level of understanding is average ($M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.11$).

This suggests that a comprehensive discussion on discrimination during school assemblies and other activities should be conducted (Garlitos, 2019).

Table 6
Level of Parents' Understanding of the Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Understanding	Educational Attainment	Mean	Sd	Interpretation
Abuse	Elementary	3.50	1.25	High
	High School	3.37	1.15	Average
	Vocational	3.70	1.23	High
	College	3.80	1.24	High
Violence	Elementary	3.59	1.15	High
	High School	3.53	1.20	High
	Vocational	3.99	1.19	High
	College	3.90	1.15	High
Exploitation	Elementary	3.50	1.17	High
	High School	3.37	1.22	Average
	Vocational	3.69	1.27	High
	College	3.89	1.13	High
Bullying	Elementary	3.42	1.18	High
	High School	3.39	1.24	Average
	Vocational	3.79	1.24	High
	College	3.87	1.03	High
Discrimination	Elementary	3.33	1.27	Average

	High School	3.33	1.16		Average	
	Vocational	3.56	1.11		High	
	College			3.73	1.12	High
Other Forms of Violations						
	Elementary	3.43	1.19		High	
	High School	3.35	1.16		Average	
	Vocational	3.66	1.18		High	
	College	3.84	1.10		High	
As a whole,						
	Elementary	3.46	1.13		High	
	High School	3.39	1.11		High	
	Vocational	3.73	1.13		High	
	College			3.84	1.07	High

Table 6 revealed that the level of parents' understanding of the child protection policy is high when grouped according to educational attainment. Obtained means of 3.46, 3.39, 3.73, and 3.84 at standard deviations of 1.13, 1.11, 1.13, and 1.07 supported these data. On the other hand, parents' understanding of child protection policy varies when issues were taken individually. In terms of abuse, elementary, vocational, and college-level parents have a high level of understanding as backed up by the obtained means 3.50, 3.70 and 3.80 at a standard deviation of 1.25, 1.23, and 1.24, respectively. On the other hand, parents whose educational attainment belonging to high school levels and graduates have an average level of understanding, as shown by the obtained mean of 3.37 and standard deviation of 1.15.

In terms of violence, parents whose education gone to elementary, high school, vocational, and college and graduate levels have a high level of understanding as revealed in the acquired mean of 3.59, 3.53, 3.99, and 3.90 at a standard deviation of 1.15, 1.20, 1.19, and 1.15.

In terms of exploitation, elementary, vocational, and college level and graduates have a high level of understanding, as shown in the acquired mean of 3.50, 3.69, and 3.89 at a standard deviation of 1.17, 1.27, and 1.13. On the other hand, parents whose educational attainment belonged to high school level and graduates have an average level of understanding as displayed in the obtained mean of 3.37 and standard deviation of 1.22.

In terms of bullying, parents whose educational attainment was elementary level and graduates, vocational level and graduates and college level and graduates have a high understanding as shown in the acquired mean of 3.42, 3.79, and 3.37 at a standard deviation of 1.18, 1.24, and 1.03. However, parents who were high school level and graduates obtained a mean of 3.39 and a standard deviation of 1.24, which is average.

In terms of discrimination, vocational and college level and graduates have a high level of understanding with an obtained mean of 3.56 and 3.73 at a standard deviation of 1.11 and 1.12. However, parents whose educational attainment belonged to elementary and high school levels and graduates have an average understanding with the acquired means of 3.33 and 3.33 at a standard deviation of 1.27 and 1.16.

Regarding other violations, parents who were elementary, vocational, and college levels and graduates obtained a mean of 3.43, 3.66, and 3.73 at a standard deviation of 1.19, 1.18, and 1.10, which is high. On the other hand, for parents whose educational attainment is high school level and graduates, their level of understanding is average, as displayed in the acquired mean of 3.35 at a standard deviation of 1.16. This indicates that high school level and graduate parents has an average level of understanding of the CPP in various issues such as abuse, exploitation, bullying, discrimination and other forms of violations and should be given highlighted in crafting diverse activities and undertakings to further elucidates parents understanding of the policy (Garlitos, 2019).

Table 7

Level of Parents' Understanding of the Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to the Number of Children

Understanding	Number of Children	Mean	Sd	Interpretation
---------------	--------------------	------	----	----------------

Abuse	1-3 children	3.45	1.25	High	
	4-6 children	3.62	1.09	High	
	More than 6 children	3.45	1.04	High	
Violence	1-3 children	3.59	1.27	High	
	4-6 children	3.76	1.03	High	
	More than 6 children	3.88	0.89	High	
Exploitation	1-3 children	3.45	1.30	High	
	4-6 children	3.62	1.04	High	
	More than 6 children	3.64	0.87	High	
Bullying	1-3 children	3.44	1.30	High	
	4-6 children	3.67	1.02	High	
	More than 6 children	3.54	0.88	High	
Discrimination	1-3 children	3.39	1.27	Average	
	4-6 children	3.45	0.98	High	
	More than 6 children	3.52	0.81	High	
Other Forms of Violations					
	1-3 children	3.42	1.23	High	
	4-6 children	3.58	1.05	High	
	More than 6 children	3.52	0.81	High	
As a whole					
	1-3 children	3.46	1.20	High	
	4-6 children	3.62	0.93	High	
	More than 6 children	3.59	0.81	High	

When grouped according to the number of children, parents' level of knowledge on the child protection policy is high. This is indicated by the obtained means of 3.46, 3.62, and 3.59 at standard deviations of 1.20, 0.93, and 0.81. Likewise, the same results were noted when issues were considered individually. Parents' knowledge of the child protection policy is high except on discrimination, where parents with 1 - 3 children level of knowledge is average ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.27$). This signifies that parents nowadays are aware of the policies and laws implemented by the government to promote the protection and safety of their children. Moreover, actions should be taken to strengthen the implementation of the CPP to make every stakeholder aware of their duties and responsibilities in promoting the well-being of children (Sannadan et. al., 2020).

Table 8

Significant Differences in Parents' Level of Understanding of Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to the Monthly Family Income

Issues	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P	Interpretation
Abuse	Between Groups	1.982	0.99		0.69	0.50	Not
	Within Groups	315.52	220	1.43			
	Total	317.50	222				significant
Violence	Between Groups	1.552	0.77		0.54	0.50	Not
	Within Groups	312.93	220	1.42			
	Total	314.48	222				significant
Exploitation	Between Groups	3.012	1.50		1.03	0.36	Not

	Within Groups	321.93	220	1.46				
Total		324.94	222				significant	
Bullying								
	Between Groups	3.69 2	1.84		1.27	0.28	Not	
	Within Groups	319.63	220	1.45				
Total		323.31	222				significant	
Discrimination								
	Between Groups	4.66 2	2.33		1.71	0.18	Not	
	Within Groups	299.55	220	1.36				
Total		304.22	222				significant	
Other Forms of Violations								
	Between Groups	3.31 2	1.66		1.22	0.30	Not	
	Within Groups	298.59	220	1.36				
Total		301.90	222				significant	
As a Whole								
	Between Groups	2.79	2	1.39		1.12	0.33	Not
	Within Groups	273.18	220	1.24				
Total		275.96	222				significant	

Using One-Way ANOVA for the significant differences in parents' understanding of the child protection policy, results revealed no significant difference in the level of understanding of parents, $F = 1.12$, $p = 0.33$. Additionally, when concerns were addressed individually, the same result of no statistically significant difference was seen. The obtained F-ratios ranging from 0.54 to 1.71 at probability values ranging from 0.18 to 0.58 supported these data. Along this line, the hypothesis which states that there are no significant differences in parents' level of understanding of child protection policy when grouped according to family income is therefore accepted.

This means that parents do not vary regarding their understanding of the child protection policy regardless of how big or small their income is.

Table 9
Significant Differences in Parents' Level of Understanding of Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to Location

Issues	Location	Mean	Sd	Df	t	p	Interpretation
Abuse	Urban	3.46	1.16	221	-0.50	0.62	Not
	Rural	3.54	1.25				Significant
Violence	Urban	3.69	1.13	221	-0.57	0.57	Not
	Rural	3.60	1.26				Significant
Exploitation	Urban	3.47	1.13	221	-0.55	0.59	Not
	Rural	3.56	1.31				Significant
Bullying	Urban	3.45	1.11	221	-0.88	0.38	Not
	Rural	3.59	1.31				Significant
Discrimination	Urban	3.33	1.11	221	-0.30	0.20	Not
	Rural	3.53	1.23				Significant
Other Forms of Violations	Urban	3.46	1.11	221	-0.13	0.90	Not

	Rural	3.48	1.23				Significant
As a Whole	Urban	3.48	1.05	221	-0.50	0.62	Not
	Rural	3.55	1.20				Significant

When grouped according to location, Table 9 shows no significant difference in parents' level of understanding of the child protection policy as revealed by the obtained value of $t = -0.50$, $p = 0.62$. Similarly, the same results of no significant difference were noted when issues were considered individually. As reflected, the obtained probability values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis stating no significant difference in parents' level of understanding of the child protection policy is accepted.

Results given in this table mean that parents living in urban areas and rural areas do not vary on the level of their understanding of the child protection policy. Their level of understanding of the policy is almost the same.

Table 10

Significant Differences in Parents' Level of Understanding of the Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to Educational Attainment

Issues	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P	Interpretation
Abuse	Between Groups	5.96	3	1.99	1.40	0.25	Not
	Within groups	311.54	219	1.42			
Total		317.50	222				Significant
Violence	Between Groups	7.32	3	2.44	1.74	0.16	Not
	Within groups	307.16	219	1.40			significant
Total		314.48	222				
Exploitation	Between Groups	8.03	3	2.68	1.85	0.14	Not
	Within groups	316.91	219	1.45			significant
Total		324.94	222				
Bullying	Between Groups	8.33	3	2.79	1.94	0.12	Not
	Within groups	314.93	219	1.44			significant
Total		323.31	222				
Discrimination	Between Groups	5.00	3	1.67	1.22	0.30	Not
	Within groups	299.22	219	1.37			significant
Total		304.22	222				
Other Forms of Violations	Between Groups	7.18	3	2.39	1.78	0.15	Not Sig-
	Within groups	294.72	219	1.35			significant
Total		301.90	222				
As a whole	Between Groups	6.71	3	2.24	1.82	0.15	Not
	Within groups	269.25	219	1.23			significant
Total		275.96	222				

When grouped according to the parents' educational attainment, Table 10 reflected that there is no significant difference in the parents' level of understanding of the child protection policy. Values of $F = 1.82$, $p = 0.15$ statistically

enforced these data. Similarly, the same results of no significant difference were also noted when issues were considered individually. Since the obtained probability values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance, the hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference in parents' level of understanding of the child protection policy, is therefore accepted.

This means that parents with elementary, high school, and college educational backgrounds do not vary their perceptions of their understanding of the child protection policy. The level of their understanding is almost the same.

Table 11

Significant Differences in Parents' Level of Understanding on the Child Protection Policy When Grouped According to the Number of Children

Issues	Sources of Variation	Sum of Squares	Df Square	Mean	F	P	Is Interpretation
Abuse	Between Groups	1.33	2	0.66	0.46	0.63	Not significant
	Within groups	316.17	220	1.44			
Total		317.50	222				
Violence	Between Groups	7.32	3	2.44	1.74	0.16	Not significant
	Within groups	307.16	219	1.40			
Total		314.48	222				
Exploitation	Between Groups	8.03	3	2.68	1.85	0.14	Not significant
	Within groups	316.91	219	1.45			
Total		324.94	222				
Bullying	Between Groups	8.33	3	2.79	1.94	0.12	Not significant
	Within groups	314.93	219	1.44			
Total		323.31	222				
Discrimination	Between Groups	5.00	3	1.67	1.22	0.30	Not significant
	Within groups	299.22	219	1.37			
Total		304.22	222				
Other Forms of Violations	Between Groups	7.18	3	2.39	1.78	0.15	Not significant
	Within groups	294.72	219	1.35			
Total		301.90	222				
As a whole	Between Groups	6.71	3	2.24	1.82	0.15	Not significant
	Within groups	269.25	219	1.23			
Total		275.96	222				

When grouped according to the number of children, Table 11 indicates no significant difference in the parents' understanding of the child protection policy, with $F = 0.49$ and $p = 0.62$. Likewise, identical results of no significant difference were observed when issues were considered individually, since the obtained probability values are greater than the 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, this hypothesis, which states that there is no significant difference in parents' level of understanding of the child protection policy, is accepted.

The result presented in this table can be interpreted that parents, regardless of the number of children they have, do not vary in their understanding of the child protection policy. The level of their understanding is almost the same.

The output of this study is an intervention plan to address the need for an adequate understanding of parents of the Child Protection Policy, revisiting, reviewing, and reiterating the provisions stipulated in DepEd Order No. 40, series of 2012, during general PTA assemblies. Suggested activities in the intervention plan were anchored on the possible meetings of the school as specified in the calendar of activities.

INTERVENTION PLAN IN CHILD PROTECTION POLICY

S.Y. 2021-2022

OBJECTIVES	INTERVENTIONS	ACTIVITIES	TIME FRAME	RESOURCES NEEDED	PERSONS INVOLVED	EXPECTED OUTCOME
To enhance parents' understanding of Child Protection Policy (DO #40, series 2012)	Enhance parents' understanding of Child Protection Policy through a symposium, either limited to face-to-face to virtual.	Conduct a conference among the school heads of Cadiz District I.	October 2021	None	District I Supervisor	School heads will be informed of the said activity.
		Setting of Schedule for the quarterly symposium.	October 2021	None	School Heads Of District I	School heads set a schedule for the quarterly symposium. The symposium was done quarterly.
		Conduct Symposium every quarter	November 2021, February 2022, April 2022, and July 2022	Lecturer Hand outs	School Heads, Parents, Teachers	
		Monitoring and Evaluation	November 2021, February 2022, April 2022, and July 2022	None	School Head, Teachers	All parents attended the symposium based on their attendance.

Conclusion

The general assessment of the level of parents' understanding of the Child Protection Policy reveals a high level of awareness among parents. This entails that parents know what Child Protection Policy is all about; however, they need an in-depth understanding of the area of discrimination. Thus, this issue should be emphasized in the conduct of general assemblies as displayed in the intervention plan. Likewise, the commitment and cooperation of all stakeholders are highly needed for the successful implementation of the policy. Likewise, a similar study may be conducted in other

city schools' divisions of Negros Occidental to confirm or deny the present investigation, and may utilize other variables not mentioned in the study.

References

- Al-Qaysi, N. (2018). The impact of child protection policy on Omani classrooms. *International Journal of Information Technology and Language Studies*, 2(1), 1-11.
- Bannon, M. J., & Carter, Y. H. (2003). Paediatricians and child protection: the need for effective education and training. *Archives of disease in childhood*, 88(7), 560-562.
- bonyi, F.O., E.O. Iyi and N. S. Machebe, (2012). Dela Peña, K. (2021, July 30). As COVID shuts down schools, homes become unsafe places for kids. *Inquirer.Net*. <https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/1466741/as-covid-shuts-down-schools-homes-become-unsafe-places-for-kids>
- DepEd Order Number 40, series of 2012. https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/DO_s2012_40.pdf
- Devaney, J. (2009). Chronic child abuse: The characteristics and careers of children caught in the child protection system. *British Journal of Social Work*, 39(1), 24-45.
- Garlitos, M. R., (2019). Level of Knowledge And Attitude of Parents On Child Protection Policy Campaign: A Basis For Program Implementation, pp. 24-33.
- Gupta, M., & Lata, P. (2013). Protection of child rights in India: Role of teachers and parents. *Educationia Confab*, 2(3), 36-44.
- Healy, K., Darlington, Y., & Feeney, J. A. (2011). Parents' participation in child protection practice: Toward respect and inclusion. *Families in society*, 92(3), 282-288.
- Karadag, S. Ç., Sönmez, S., & Dereobalı, N. (2015). An investigation of preschool teachers' recognition of possible child abuse and neglect in Izmir, Turkey. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 30(5), 873-891.
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel psychology*, 28(4), 563-575.
- Malipot, M. (2021, July 19). DepEd lauded for establishing Child Protection Unit during pandemic. *The Manila Bulletin*. <https://mb.com.ph/2021/07/19/deped-lauded-for-establishing-child-protection-unit-during-pandemic/>
- Poreddi, V., Pashapu, D. R., Kathyayani, B. V., Gandhi, S., El-Arousy, W., & Math, S. B. (2016). Nursing students' knowledge of child abuse and neglect in India. *British journal of nursing*, 25(5), 264-268.
- Roche, S. (2017). Child protection and maltreatment in the Philippines: A systematic review of the literature. *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, 4(1), 104-128.
- Ruelo, L., Moneva, J., & Quesio, C. (2020). Knowledge and Extent of Welfare and Safety Provisions of Child Protection Law in Philippines- A Case Study, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21013/jems.v16.n2.p3>
- Sannadan, D. B., San Pedro, C. B., Velchez, L. M. T., & Venida, A. C. (2020). Analysis of School Conflicts Involving Parents: Experiences and Resolution. *Jurnal Inovatif Ilmu Pendidikan*, 2(2), 73-91.
- Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, 34(1), 8-12.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; how to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research. How to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in a research (August 10, 2016).
- Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International journal of medical education*, 2, 53.
- Yekta, M., Bagherian, F., & Nezhad, M. A. S. (2011). The attitudes of adults toward child abuse. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 278-282.
- Zamora, K., & Madrigal D. (2018). Child Protection Policy Compliance in an Catholic Educational Institution, 4 (2) 22-34