

Animated Video and Role Play for School-Based Bullying Prevention



La Masahuddin ^a  | Hijrah ^a 

^aDepartment of Nursing, Pelamonia Institute of Health Sciences, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

Abstract: Bullying prevention in elementary schools requires learning activities that help children recognize harmful behavior and practice safe responses. This community service program implemented animated-video education and role play at SD Inpres 156 Makammu, Takalar Regency, South Sulawesi, from 11 to 16 May 2026. The program used a descriptive implementation-evaluation design organized into three phases: preparation, implementation, and monitoring with follow-up. Program documentation included activity records, facilitator observations, educational materials, and photographs. The target group comprised students, teachers, and parents or guardians, with an initial participation target of approximately 30 people. The available records did not contain a verified attendance roster or participant characteristics; consequently, the actual number and profile of participants could not be reported. The program delivered classroom video sessions, guided discussion, role-play exercises, school communication materials, a teacher guide, and initial consultation on school bullying procedures. Facilitator notes documented student participation in discussion and simulated responses to bullying scenarios. Planned pre-test, post-test, and focus-group data were not retained in an analyzable form, so changes in knowledge, attitudes, behavior, or bullying occurrence could not be determined. The findings describe program delivery and observed engagement only. Future implementation should use attendance records, standardized outcome instruments, and follow-up assessment to evaluate changes beyond immediate participation.

Keywords: Animated video; Bullying prevention; Character education; Elementary school; Role play.

1. Introduction

Bullying remains a persistent threat to students' safety and participation in education. The Situation Analysis of Children in Indonesia reported that 41% of 15-year-old students had experienced bullying at least several times within a month, indicating that peer aggression is not confined to isolated incidents (Dwi et al., 2021; Harsono & Febriyana, 2026). International evidence similarly links bullying victimization with adverse psychosocial and educational outcomes, while emphasizing that prevention requires coordinated action at the classroom and school levels (Gaffney et al., 2021; Tran et al., 2026).

Indonesia strengthened the policy basis for school violence prevention through Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology Regulation No. 46 of 2023. The regulation required education units to establish prevention and response mechanisms and to involve school personnel, students, parents, and other relevant stakeholders (Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). Policy requirements alone do not ensure implementation. Schools need age-appropriate materials, opportunities for students to rehearse responses, accessible reporting procedures, and staff who can reinforce consistent messages.

Preliminary observation and communication with SD Inpres 156 Makammu identified a specific implementation gap. Students did not consistently distinguish bullying from joking, particularly when behavior involved ridicule, derogatory nicknames, pushing, or social exclusion. The school had limited contextual teaching materials and did not yet have a structured prevention and response procedure aligned with the national regulation. Its rural location also constrained access to audiovisual learning resources. These conditions supported



a practical program combining animated video, guided discussion, role play, teacher materials, and school-family communication.

Animated video can present recognizable school situations in language and imagery suited to children, while role play allows students to rehearse assertive communication, help-seeking, and bystander responses. Meta-analytic evidence indicates that school-based programs can reduce bullying and victimization, although effects vary with program content and implementation quality (Gaffney et al., 2021; Saman & Amal, 2026). Bystander-focused interventions may also improve students' willingness and capacity to intervene safely (Borthakur et al., 2025; Coker et al., 2019). Indonesian studies have reported gains in bullying-related understanding after animated-video education, providing contextual support for the selected media (Karimah et al., 2024; Nurfaiziah et al., 2024).

This community service program aimed to implement an age-appropriate bullying-prevention package at SD Inpres 156 Makammu and to document its delivery, immediate student engagement, educational outputs, and school follow-up activities. Because analyzable pre-intervention and post-intervention data were unavailable, the report does not evaluate intervention effectiveness or changes in bullying behavior

2. Materials and Methods

The program was conducted at SD Inpres 156 Makammu, Paranglabbua Hamlet, Bulukunyi Urban Village, Polongbangkeng Timur District, Takalar Regency, South Sulawesi, from 11 to 16 May 2026. It used a descriptive implementation-evaluation design. The intended participants were elementary-school students, teachers, and parents or guardians. Planning documents set a target of approximately 30 participants, but the final documentation did not include a verified attendance roster, age distribution, grade level, sex, or stakeholder composition. The target figure is therefore not presented as the achieved sample size.

The intervention structure drew on school-wide prevention principles that combine student learning, adult involvement, clear response procedures, and reinforcement beyond a single classroom session (Gaffney et al., 2021). The role-play component also reflected evidence that structured bystander activities can support prosocial responses to bullying situations (Polanin et al., 2012).

The program comprised three phases:

- a. Preparation. The team coordinated with school representatives, reviewed locally reported bullying situations, selected and adapted animated educational content, prepared guided-discussion prompts, developed role-play scenarios, and drafted teacher and campaign materials. The content addressed physical, verbal, social, and cyberbullying; possible consequences; the distinction between joking and harmful repeated behavior; safe help-seeking; and the transition from passive bystander to supportive upstander.
- b. Implementation. Facilitators introduced key concepts, presented animated videos, guided students through case analysis, and conducted supervised role-play exercises. Students alternated among roles representing a student experiencing bullying, a student engaging in bullying, and a witness. Facilitators emphasized safe interruption, seeking adult assistance, supporting peers, and reporting incidents. Brief campaign messages were prepared for school noticeboards and parent communication channels, and teachers received a guide for subsequent classroom use.
- c. Monitoring and follow-up. Facilitators and teachers recorded narrative observations of student participation during discussion and simulation. The school was invited to review its rules, reporting pathway, and prevention arrangements in relation to the 2023 national regulation. Follow-up also covered revision of teaching materials based on implementation experience.

The original plan included student knowledge and attitude pre-tests and post-tests and focus-group discussions. The available program report did not retain completed instruments, individual scores, participant denominators, focus-group transcripts, or a coding framework. These planned measures were excluded from outcome analysis. The present article uses only documented process evidence: activity records, facilitator observations, produced educational materials, photographs, and recorded follow-up actions. No inferential statistical analysis was performed. Observations were summarized narratively and interpreted as evidence of delivery and engagement, not as changes in knowledge, attitudes, behavior, school safety, or bullying incidence.

3. Results

The program was delivered through the same three phases described in the Methods section. The records confirm completion of preparatory coordination and material development, classroom delivery using animated

video and role play, process monitoring, and initial school follow-up. The exact number and characteristics of attendees could not be established from the retained documentation.

Table 1. Documented implementation outputs and evidence sources

Domain	Documented result	Available evidence
Educational materials	Animated content, guided-discussion prompts, role-play scenarios, campaign messages, and a teacher guide were prepared.	Program materials and activity documentation
Classroom delivery	Animated-video viewing, facilitated case discussion, and supervised role play were conducted.	Activity records and photographs
Observed engagement	Facilitator notes described students asking and answering questions, sharing examples, and participating in simulated responses.	Narrative observation notes; no standardized scale
School follow-up	Initial discussion addressed clearer school rules, reporting pathways, and future reuse of the materials.	Follow-up notes; no evidence of policy adoption or enforcement

During the video and discussion session, facilitators observed that students could contribute examples and respond to prompts about physical, verbal, and social bullying. During role play, students participated in scenarios involving help-seeking, peer support, and reporting to an adult. These observations show participation in the learning activities. They do not establish that all students acquired the intended knowledge or could apply the responses outside the facilitated setting.

The program also produced communication materials for the school and parents and initiated discussion about incorporating clearer anti-bullying rules and response procedures into school practice. The documentation did not confirm formal adoption of a revised policy, formation of a prevention and response team, dissemination reach, or subsequent handling of reported incidents.

No numerical knowledge, attitude, behavior, or bullying-incidence outcomes were available. The planned pre-test, post-test, and focus-group evaluation could not be reported because the required datasets and records were absent.



Figure 1. Bullying education for elementary school students

4. Discussion

The documented contribution of this program was the delivery of a multicomponent bullying-prevention activity in a rural elementary-school setting. Animated video provided a common scenario for discussion, while role play required students to respond verbally and behaviorally within a supervised exercise. The observation that students participated in questions, case discussion, and simulation indicates that the format was workable during the scheduled sessions. It does not demonstrate improved knowledge, attitudes, empathy, prosocial behavior, or reduced bullying because those outcomes were not measured with analyzable instruments.

The combination of audiovisual explanation and behavioral rehearsal has a plausible educational basis. Animated material can make abstract distinctions, such as the difference between joking and bullying, more concrete for children (Ramdhanie et al., 2024; Saba et al., 2023). Role play then shifts the task from recognizing a situation to practicing a response. Indonesian development studies have found animated bullying-prevention materials acceptable for elementary-school learning, while wider reviews show that multicomponent school programs can reduce bullying and victimization when implementation is sustained and embedded in school systems (Oktaviana & Rusnilawati, 2022). Those studies provide a rationale for the approach, but their measured effects cannot be transferred to the present program without comparable outcome data.

The local implementation gap extended beyond student awareness. Preliminary observations indicated limited teaching materials and an absence of a structured school response mechanism. For this reason, teacher guidance, parent communication, and discussion of reporting procedures were included. This direction is consistent with evidence that effective prevention generally involves the school environment rather than a single student session (Domitrovich et al., 2008; Rachman et al., 2024). The available documentation confirms that these activities were initiated, but it does not show whether the school formally adopted a policy, established a functioning response team, or maintained the activities after the program.

Several limitations restrict interpretation. The achieved participant number and demographic characteristics were not documented. Attendance and exposure to each activity could not be verified. Process observations were narrative and were made by the implementation team, with no standardized observation form or independent assessor. Planned pre-test, post-test, and focus-group data were unavailable, and no baseline or follow-up measure of bullying incidents was collected. The report can therefore support conclusions about implementation and observed session participation only. Subsequent programs should retain signed attendance records, define the denominator for every result, use age-appropriate validated measures, document implementation fidelity, and conduct delayed follow-up with students and school personnel.

5. Conclusions

Animated-video education, guided discussion, and role play were delivered at SD Inpres 156 Makammu together with teacher materials, school-family communication, and initial discussion of bullying-response procedures. Facilitator records documented student participation during the sessions. The absence of verified participant data and analyzable pre-test, post-test, focus-group, and follow-up outcomes prevents conclusions about changes in knowledge, attitudes, behavior, school safety, or bullying occurrence. A future implementation should combine the same practical activities with complete attendance records, standardized evaluation, and follow-up of school procedures and student outcomes.

Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest

References

- Borthakur, D., Crockett, L., Mihalchan, J., Swann, J., & Saikia, M. J. (2025). Empowering bystanders: a psychological and institutional model for intervention in academic bullying. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 16, 1650438. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1650438>
- Coker, A. L., Bush, H. M., Brancato, C. J., Clear, E. R., & Recktenwald, E. A. (2019). Bystander Program Effectiveness to Reduce Violence Acceptance: RCT in High Schools. *Journal of Family Violence*, 34(3), 153–164. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-018-9961-8>
- Domitrovich, C. E., Bradshaw, C. P., Poduska, J. M., Hoagwood, K., Buckley, J. A., Olin, S., Romanelli, L. H., Leaf, P. J., Greenberg, M. T., & Jalongo, N. S. (2008). Maximizing the Implementation Quality of Evidence-Based

- Preventive Interventions in Schools: A Conceptual Framework. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion*, 1(3), 6–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1754730x.2008.9715730>
- Dwi, V., Nurul, W., Imron, M., & Eddy, A. (2021). Characteristics of Bullying by Elementary School Students in Indonesia : A Literature Review. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 618(Ijcah), 1287–1296.
- Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2021). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying perpetration and victimization: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 17(2), e1143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cl2.1143>
- Harsono, C. S., & Febriyana, N. (2026). Understanding and Addressing Bullying in Children and Adolescents. *Journal of the Korean Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.5765/jkacap.250040>
- Karimah, A. F., Julia, J., Iswara, P. D., Ismail, A., Gusrayani, D., & Isrokatun, I. (2024). Penggunaan Video Animasi untuk Meningkatkan Pengetahuan dan Kesadaran Siswa Sekolah Dasar Terhadap Perundungan. *Ideguru: Jurnal Karya Ilmiah Guru*, 9(1 SE-Research Articles), 416–424. <https://doi.org/10.51169/ideguru.v9i1.841>
- Nurfaiziah, H., Mustika, N. L., Rabbani, R. B., Fathonah, V. A., & Nugraha, R. G. (2024). Pengembangan Video Animasi Tentang Pencegahan Perilaku Bullying di Sekolah Dasar. *Innovative: Journal Of Social Science Research*, 4(3 SE-Articles), 8537–8547. <https://doi.org/10.31004/innovative.v4i3.11253>
- oktaviana, D., & Rusnilawati, R. (2022). Role Playing with Digital Comics in Preventing Bullying and Cyberbullying Behavior in Elementary School. *Jurnal Ilmiah Sekolah Dasar*, 6, 603–609. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jisd.v6i4.53685>
- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Bullying Prevention Programs' Effects on Bystander Intervention Behavior. *School Psychology Review*, 41(1), 47–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02796015.2012.12087375>
- Rachman, M., Muslim, S., Suparman, D., & Norman, E. (2024). Effective Communication Strategies between Teachers and Parents through a Collaborative Approach to Improve Student Achievement in Primary Schools. *Jurnal Dirosah Islamiyah*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.47467/jdi.v6i3.5329>
- Ramdhania, G. G., Nurrohman, A., Mulya, A. P., Mediani, H. S., Sumarni, N., Mulyana, A. M., & Huda, M. H. (2024). A Scoping Review of Audiovisual Distraction Techniques Among Children in Reducing Invasive Procedure Pain. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 17, 4363–4372. <https://doi.org/10.2147/JMDH.S479107>
- Saba, P., Qi, H., Saleem, A., Chen, I.-J., Kausar, F. N., & Iqbal, M. F. (2023). Effects of Animated Movies on the Aggression and Behavior Performance of Primary School Students and Their Control Using a Cognitive Behavioral Anger-Control Training (CBACT) Program. *Behavioral Sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, 13(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13080659>
- Saman, A., & Amal, A. (2026). Development of Animated Series-Based Learning Media to Stimulate Oral Expression Skills in Children Aged 5 – 6 Years. *Indonesian Journal of Early Childhood Educational Research*, 5(June), 146–161.
- Tran, T. T. N., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Bennett, J. (2026). Teachers' responses to student bullying: A systematic literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 176, 105461. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2026.105461>