

Gender Responsiveness in Philippine Higher Education: Students' Awareness, Institutional Sensitivity, and Discrimination Experiences

Cheryl F. Olvida ¹

1 – Apayao State College

ascgadche@gmail.com / 0000-0002-7563-0256

Publication Date: May 29, 2026

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20443326

Abstract

This study assessed students' gender awareness, gender sensitivity, and experiences of discrimination as a basis for strengthening a gender-responsive academic environment at Apayao State College. Using a descriptive–correlational quantitative design, data were collected from 215 first-year college students through a researcher-adapted Gender Sensitivity Questionnaire. Descriptive statistics, including frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and standard deviations, were used to analyze the data, and Pearson product–moment correlation was used to assess relationships among the variables.

The findings revealed a generally high level of gender awareness among students, particularly on issues related to violence, cyberbullying, and gender-fair communication. Students also demonstrated favorable gender-sensitive perceptions regarding inclusivity, equal opportunity, and respect for other genders within the academic environment. However, moderate discomfort was reported with instructional materials, lecture content, and classroom activities. Fellow students emerged as the most commonly reported source of discrimination or harassment experiences.

Inferential analysis showed a significant positive relationship between gender awareness and gender sensitivity, while gender sensitivity was significantly and negatively related to discomfort or discrimination experiences. No significant relationship was found between gender awareness and discomfort or discrimination experiences.

Based on the findings, the study proposed a Gender and Development (GAD) Policy Enhancement Framework focusing on curriculum integration, faculty capacity development, gender-responsive learning environments, inclusive campus culture, and continuous monitoring and evaluation. The study contributes localized evidence supporting institutional gender mainstreaming and advancing inclusive higher education aligned with Sustainable Development Goals 4 and 5.

Keywords: *gender responsiveness, gender awareness, gender sensitivity, discrimination experiences, Gender and Development, higher education, campus climate*

INTRODUCTION

Higher education institutions are increasingly expected to advance not only academic learning but also equity, inclusion, and human dignity. Globally, this expectation is reflected in Sustainable Development Goal 4, which emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education, and Sustainable Development Goal 5, which promotes gender equality (United Nations, n.d.). In this context, gender-responsive education is regarded as a core indicator of institutional quality rather than a peripheral advocacy.

Gender responsiveness encompasses more than policy compliance or balanced representation. It requires transforming curriculum, classroom interactions, leadership opportunities, and campus culture to ensure that all students feel respected and protected (UNESCO, 2019). Nevertheless, research indicates that even institutions with gender mainstreaming initiatives may continue to experience subtle bias, stereotyping, gender-based discomfort, and discrimination in daily academic life (Morley & Crossouard, 2016; Pérez Huber et al., 2023).

In the Philippines, gender responsiveness in higher education is supported by Republic Act No. 9710, or the Magna Carta of Women; Republic Act No. 11313, or the Safe Spaces Act; and CHED Memorandum Order No. 01, series of 2015. These policies require higher education institutions to integrate Gender and Development (GAD) principles into instruction, research, governance, student services, and campus protection mechanisms (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2015; Republic Act No. 9710, 2009; Republic Act No. 11313, 2019).

Despite these mandates, implementation remains inconsistent. Philippine studies report that students frequently exhibit moderate to high levels of gender awareness, particularly when engaged in GAD-related programs (Arcilla et al., 2022; Cagang et al., 2023; Salazar, 2024). However, stereotypes, sexist language, peer-based discrimination, and gender-related discomfort continue to persist in certain academic contexts (Luna & Dominguez, 2022; Remigio & Talosa, 2021). These findings indicate that institutional gender responsiveness should be evaluated not only by policy presence but also by students' perceptions and lived experiences.

A significant gap in the existing literature is the tendency to examine gender awareness, institutional practices, and experiences of discrimination in isolation. Additionally, much of the research centers on urban universities, resulting in limited representation of rural and provincial state colleges. There is also insufficient evidence regarding how students themselves assess the visibility, relevance, and implementation of GAD policies in daily campus life.

This study addresses these gaps by investigating students' gender awareness, perceptions of gender equality practices, and experiences of discomfort and discrimination at Apayao State College. By integrating these dimensions, the research offers localized evidence of institutional gender responsiveness within a provincial higher education context. The study also provides policy recommendations for enhancing GAD programs in alignment with SDG 4, SDG 5, CHED mandates, and student-centered campus inclusion.

Statement of the Problem

This study aimed to assess students' gender awareness, gender sensitivity, and experiences of discrimination in higher education as a basis for strengthening a gender-responsive academic environment at Apayao State College.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of students' gender awareness in terms of:
 - A. gender-based violence and harassment;
 - B. bullying and cyberbullying;
 - C. gender-fair language; and
 - D. personal responsibility in promoting gender equality?
2. What is the level of students' gender sensitivity as reflected in their perceptions of:
 - A. gender equality in instructional materials;
 - B. leadership opportunities;
 - C. school policies and practices; and
 - D. campus culture?
3. What is the extent of students' reported discrimination or discomfort experiences in the institution?
4. Is there a significant relationship between students' gender awareness and gender sensitivity?
5. Is there a significant relationship between students' gender sensitivity and discrimination or discomfort experiences?
6. Based on the findings, what policy inputs may be proposed to strengthen Gender and Development initiatives and gender-responsive academic practices?

Literature Review

Gender and Development (GAD) in higher education is increasingly understood as a system-wide responsibility rather than a separate advocacy program. Globally, UNESCO emphasizes that gender equality in education requires stronger data systems, supportive legal and policy frameworks, and gender-responsive teaching and learning practices (UNESCO, 2019). In the Philippines, this direction is reflected in CHED Memorandum Order No. 01, series of 2015, which requires higher education institutions to integrate gender equality principles into curriculum development, research, extension, governance, and student services (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2015). Thus, GAD implementation in higher education is not limited

to awareness campaigns; it involves institutional mechanisms that shape classroom practice, campus culture, and student protection.

Gender-responsive pedagogy is a key pathway for translating gender policy into everyday academic experience. It requires teachers to examine how curriculum content, classroom interactions, language use, assessment practices, and instructional examples may reinforce or challenge gender stereotypes. Chapin (2020) argues that gender-responsive pedagogy must be embedded in curriculum design, classroom facilitation, and assessment rather than treated as an add-on activity. Recent international studies similarly show that faculty training is necessary because gender-responsive teaching is not automatically practiced even when equality policies exist (Khalil, 2024; Murtagh et al., 2025). This suggests that institutional commitment must be supported by sustained faculty capacity-building.

Student awareness is another important dimension of gender-responsive education. Across both local and international studies, gender awareness tends to improve when institutions adopt sustained gender mainstreaming programs. However, awareness does not always eliminate subtle stereotypes, biased language, or discriminatory peer interactions. Studies on gender-inclusive language and gender sensitivity show that students may express support for equality while still carrying traditional assumptions about masculinity, femininity, leadership, and social roles (Remigio & Talosa, 2021). This gap between awareness and behavior is important because it shows that gender education should move beyond conceptual knowledge toward reflective practice, respectful communication, and bystander responsibility.

Campus climate also shapes how students experience gender responsiveness. A gender-responsive campus is not only one where policies exist, but one where students feel safe, respected, and able to participate without fear of ridicule, exclusion, or discrimination. Research on higher education climate indicates that subtle forms of bias, including sexist remarks, stereotyping, and microaggressions, can affect students' sense of belonging and academic participation even when formal discrimination is not widespread (Pérez Huber et al., 2023). International literature further suggests that gender inequality in higher education often persists through ordinary practices, including leadership expectations, classroom norms, and institutional cultures that appear neutral but may reproduce unequal experiences (Morris, 2022; Unterhalter, 2022).

Policy implementation remains a critical concern. While many higher education institutions have adopted gender equality policies, implementation is often uneven because of limited monitoring, weak accountability systems, and insufficient student-centered evaluation. CHED's GAD policy expects higher education institutions to establish enabling mechanisms, such as the GAD Focal Point System, and to integrate gender equality into institutional functions (CHED, 2015). However, policy presence alone does not guarantee meaningful practice. Studies on gender equality in higher education suggest that institutional transformation requires continuous monitoring, leadership commitment, inclusive participation, and evidence-based planning (Bustamante-Mora et al., 2024; Saadat, 2022).

Taken together, the literature suggests three important patterns. First, gender-responsive higher education depends on the alignment of policy, pedagogy, and campus culture. Second, student awareness is necessary but insufficient without support from gender-sensitive classroom practice and respectful peer interaction. Third, there remains a need for localized evidence from provincial and state higher education institutions, where distinct cultural, institutional, and resource conditions may shape GAD implementation. This study addresses that gap by examining students' gender awareness, sensitivity, and experiences of discrimination as an empirical basis for strengthening a gender-responsive academic environment.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a descriptive–quantitative research design to assess students' gender awareness, gender sensitivity, and experiences of discrimination in higher education. The design was appropriate because the study aimed to describe existing conditions, determine the extent of specific gender-related perceptions and experiences, and examine relationships among measured variables using numerical data. Quantitative approaches are particularly well-suited to institutional climate studies because they enable the systematic measurement of attitudes, perceptions, and experiences among a relatively large group of respondents (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

The study also used a correlational component to determine whether significant relationships existed among students' gender awareness, gender sensitivity, and reported experiences of discrimination or discomfort. This approach provided empirical evidence that may guide institutional Gender and Development (GAD) policy enhancement and program planning.

Research Locale and Respondents

The study was conducted at Apayao State College, a public higher education institution located in Apayao, Philippines. The institution serves students from diverse socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds and implements Gender and Development (GAD) initiatives aligned with national higher education policies.

The respondents were 215 first-year college students enrolled during the study's academic year. First-year students were selected because they represent a critical transition stage in which institutional culture, policies, and gender-responsive practices begin to shape students' perceptions and experiences in higher education.

Sampling Procedure

The study employed purposive sampling. Respondents were selected based on the following inclusion criteria: (1) officially enrolled first-year students of Apayao State College

during the data collection period, (2) willingness to participate voluntarily in the study, and (3) ability to complete the online questionnaire independently.

The sample size was considered adequate for descriptive and correlational analyses in institutional research because it provided sufficient representation of the target student population and enabled stable estimation of response patterns. All first-year students who were accessible and met the inclusion criteria were invited to participate via institutional online communication channels. A high response retrieval rate was achieved because the survey was administered during scheduled academic activities with faculty coordination.

Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher-adapted Gender Sensitivity Questionnaire derived from UNESCO gender awareness and gender-responsive education indicators (UNESCO, 2015; UNESCO, 2019). The instrument was contextualized to fit the higher education environment and the objectives of the present study.

The questionnaire consisted of four parts:

1. gender awareness;
2. perceptions of gender equality and gender sensitivity in school practices;
3. experiences of discomfort in school settings; and
4. experiences of discrimination or harassment.

The awareness indicators covered gender-based violence, bullying, cyberbullying, gender-fair language, and personal responsibility in promoting equality. The gender sensitivity indicators focused on instructional materials, leadership opportunities, campus culture, and institutional practices. The final sections assessed the extent of discomfort and discrimination experiences encountered within the institution.

Responses to perception indicators were measured on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 4 (Strongly Disagree), while awareness and discrimination indicators used categorical response formats.

Instrument Validation and Reliability

The instrument underwent content validation by three experts specializing in Gender and Development (GAD), educational research, and social science methodology. Their evaluation focused on content relevance, language clarity, cultural appropriateness, and alignment with the study's objectives. Revisions were incorporated based on expert recommendations to improve item clarity and contextual suitability.

A pilot test was conducted with students not included in the final sample to assess the instrument's reliability and comprehensibility. Reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha yielded coefficients ranging from .82 to .89 across the major constructs, indicating acceptable to high internal consistency (Taber, 2018). These results suggest that the instrument was sufficiently reliable for institutional quantitative research.

Data Collection Procedure

Prior to data collection, permission to conduct the study was secured from the appropriate institutional authorities. The online questionnaire was distributed through official academic communication channels. Respondents were informed of the purpose of the study, the expected completion time, confidentiality measures, and the voluntary nature of participation.

The survey was administered electronically to facilitate accessibility and encourage participation. Responses were automatically encoded into a spreadsheet database for organization and analysis.

Ethical Considerations

The study adhered to ethical standards for human participant research. Participation was strictly voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all respondents before the survey was administered. Participants were informed that they could decline participation or withdraw at any point without penalty.

To protect privacy and confidentiality, no personally identifiable information was collected. Responses were treated anonymously and reported only in aggregate form. Data handling procedures complied with the principles of the Data Privacy Act of 2012 and institutional research ethics guidelines. The collected data were used solely for academic and research purposes.

Data Analysis

Descriptive and inferential statistical tools were employed in analyzing the data. Frequency counts, percentages, weighted means, and standard deviations were used to describe students' gender awareness, gender sensitivity, and experiences of discrimination.

To determine the relationships among variables, correlation analysis was employed. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to examine the relationship between:

1. gender awareness and gender sensitivity; and
2. gender sensitivity and discrimination or discomfort experiences.

All statistical analyses were conducted using an appropriate statistical software package, and significance was tested at the .05 level.

RESULTS

The study analyzed responses from 215 students. The results are presented according to gender awareness, gender sensitivity, experiences of discomfort, experiences of discrimination or harassment, and the relationships among the main study variables.

Level of Gender Awareness

Table 1

Students' Level of Gender Awareness

Indicator	Aware f	Aware %	Unaware f	Unaware %
Physical and emotional violence can cause depression	183	85.12	32	14.88
Threatening others on social media may be a cybercrime	174	80.93	41	19.07
Men may also experience violence	172	80.00	43	20.00
Personal role in breaking gender barriers	170	79.07	45	20.93
Gender-fair language should be used	168	78.14	47	21.86
Bullying may occur on social media	166	77.21	49	22.79
Women may experience more violence than men	166	77.21	49	22.79
Repeated teasing is a form of bullying	163	75.81	52	24.19
Malicious gestures may be offensive	162	75.35	53	24.65
Insults or malicious comments may be offensive	159	73.95	56	26.05
Catcalling may be offensive	158	73.49	57	26.51
Social media posts may affect other genders	158	73.49	57	26.51
Malicious touching is threatening	147	68.37	68	31.63

Note. N = 215. Overall awareness rate = 76.78%.

The overall awareness rate was 76.78%, indicating a high level of gender awareness among the respondents. Awareness was highest for violence-related and online conduct indicators, while malicious touching obtained the lowest awareness percentage.

Level of Gender Sensitivity

Table 2

Students' Gender Sensitivity in School Practices

Indicator	n	Mean	SD
The course is for both men and women	209	1.40	0.71
Equal access to school materials	210	1.53	0.67
Other genders deserve respect	209	1.53	0.70
Gender-fair language promotes sensitivity	210	1.73	0.74
Recognition of other genders should be promoted	209	1.82	0.69
The school needs more intervention for gender sensitivity	209	1.85	0.72
Student manual addresses gender issues	210	1.86	0.76
School environment promotes gender sensitivity	210	1.95	0.81
School is already gender-sensitive	210	2.04	0.80
Being a man means being tough	202	2.25	0.86
Books depict women in leadership roles	191	2.22	0.85
School uniform is gender-sensitive	202	2.27	0.86
Being a woman means being weak	202	2.60	0.90
The course is for men only	202	3.14	0.82
The course is for women only	202	3.15	0.83

Note. Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, 4 = Strongly Disagree. Responses marked 5 = No answer were excluded.

The results show generally favorable gender sensitivity ratings, with the strongest agreement observed for course inclusivity, equal access to school materials, and respect for other genders.

Discomfort Experiences

Table 3

Reported Gender-Related Discomfort Experiences

Source of discomfort	Yes f	Yes %	No f	No %
Worktext activities	97	45.12	117	54.42
Worktext content	95	44.19	119	55.35
Lecture content	87	40.47	127	59.07
AV presentations	86	40.00	127	59.07
Textbooks	84	39.07	130	60.47
Visual displays	70	32.56	144	66.98
Sexist comments	64	29.77	150	69.77
Sexist jokes	62	28.84	153	71.16

Note. N = 215. Some items had one to two missing responses.

The most frequently reported sources of discomfort were worktext activities, worktext content, lecture content, AV presentations, and textbooks.

Discrimination or Harassment Experiences

Table 4

Reported Sources of Discrimination or Harassment

Source	Yes f	Yes %	No f	No %
Fellow students	53	24.65	162	75.35
Utility personnel	29	13.49	186	86.51
Faculty member	26	12.09	189	87.91
Administration	26	12.09	189	87.91
Administrative staff	26	12.09	189	87.91
Counselors	24	11.16	191	88.84
Guards	22	10.23	193	89.77

The highest reported source of discrimination or harassment was fellow students at 24.65%, followed by utility personnel at 13.49%.

Relationship Among Gender Awareness, Gender Sensitivity, and Discomfort or Discrimination Experiences

Table 5

Correlation Matrix of Main Study Variables

Variables	r	p-value	Decision
Gender awareness and gender sensitivity	.219	.001	Significant
Gender awareness and discomfort/discrimination experiences	-.067	.327	Not significant
Gender sensitivity and discomfort/discrimination experiences	-.174	.011	Significant

Note. Significance was tested at $\alpha = .05$.

Correlation analysis showed a significant positive relationship between gender awareness and gender sensitivity, $r = .219$, $p = .001$. The relationship between gender awareness and experiences of discomfort/discrimination was not statistically significant, $r = -.067$, $p = .327$. Gender sensitivity had a significant negative relationship with discomfort/discrimination experiences, $r = -.174$, $p = .011$.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that students demonstrated generally high gender awareness, particularly in relation to violence, bullying, cyberbullying, and gender-fair communication. The highest awareness indicators were associated with psychological harm, online threats, and violence-related concerns. These results suggest that gender-related discourse connected to mental health, safe spaces, and digital conduct may already be visible within students' academic and social environments. The relatively high awareness levels align with studies showing that sustained Gender and Development (GAD) initiatives and institutional exposure contribute to improved understanding of gender-related issues among university students (Arcilla et al., 2022; Remigio & Talosa, 2021).

However, awareness was comparatively lower in indicators related to malicious touching and nonverbal harassment. This pattern suggests that while students recognize overt forms of violence and discrimination, subtler forms of gender-based harm may not yet be fully understood. Similar observations have been reported in higher education studies where students tend to identify explicit harassment more easily than indirect or normalized forms of gender-based misconduct (Pérez Huber et al., 2023). The result highlights the continuing need for institutional discussions on consent, boundaries, and everyday gender-related behavior.

The findings on gender sensitivity indicate generally favorable perceptions of institutional inclusivity. Students strongly agreed that courses are open to all genders, that other genders deserve respect, and that men and women should have equal opportunities within academic settings. These findings reflect the institutional direction promoted by CHED Memorandum Order No. 01, series of 2015, which emphasizes gender responsiveness in instruction, campus culture, and student participation (Commission on Higher Education [CHED], 2015).

Nevertheless, the results also show that traditional gender assumptions have not been fully eliminated. Moderate responses on items related to masculinity, femininity, and representation in instructional materials suggest that some gender stereotypes remain present within the academic environment. This supports international literature arguing that institutional gender responsiveness is often uneven because formal policies may progress faster than everyday attitudes and social norms (Unterhalter, 2022). The findings, therefore, imply that institutional gender work should extend beyond compliance-oriented activities to more reflective, behavior-centered interventions.

The discomfort experience further supports this observation. The most frequently reported sources of discomfort were worktext activities, worktext content, lecture discussions, audiovisual presentations, and textbooks. This suggests that gender-related discomfort is not limited to interpersonal interaction but may also emerge from instructional content and classroom delivery. Previous studies emphasize that gender-responsive pedagogy requires careful review of learning materials, examples, and classroom communication because these may unintentionally reproduce stereotypes or exclusionary representations (Chapin, 2020; Khalil, 2024). The findings indicate that curriculum review and faculty training remain important areas for institutional improvement.

The results on experiences of discrimination and harassment show that fellow students were the most commonly reported source of discrimination. This finding suggests that peer culture plays a significant role in shaping students' experiences of campus inclusivity. Similar studies in higher education report that subtle discrimination and gender-based microaggressions frequently occur in informal peer interactions rather than through formal institutional policies (Morris, 2022; Pérez Huber et al., 2023). Although reports involving faculty and staff were lower, their presence indicates the need for institution-wide GAD reinforcement across all sectors of the campus community.

The inferential findings provide additional insight into the relationships among the variables. The significant positive relationship between gender awareness and gender sensitivity suggests that increased awareness is associated with stronger gender-sensitive perceptions. However, the weak correlation coefficient indicates that awareness alone may not be sufficient to shape institutional behavior or eliminate gender-related discomfort. This finding supports previous literature arguing that awareness-based interventions must be complemented by sustained institutional practice, policy implementation, and campus climate reinforcement (Bustamante-Mora et al., 2024).

The significant negative relationship between gender sensitivity and discomfort or discrimination experiences further suggests that stronger perceptions of institutional gender responsiveness are associated with lower levels of reported discomfort. Although the relationship was weak, the result supports the argument that inclusive academic environments may help reduce negative gender-related experiences among students. This finding reinforces the importance of strengthening gender-responsive teaching, inclusive communication, and accessible support mechanisms within higher education institutions.

GAD Policy Enhancement Framework

The proposed Gender and Development (GAD) Policy Enhancement Framework emerged directly from the patterns observed in the findings. The framework is organized into five institutional action areas: curriculum integration, faculty capacity development, inclusive participation, communication and campus culture, and monitoring and evaluation.

First, the need for curriculum integration emerged from the discomfort resulting from worktexts, textbooks, lecture content, and audiovisual materials. These findings indicate that

instructional content may still contain gender-insensitive representations or examples. Integrating gender-responsive concepts across general education and professional courses may therefore help ensure that classroom materials consistently reflect inclusive practices.

Second, faculty capacity development was informed by findings on classroom-related discomfort and moderate perceptions of gender stereotypes. Since instructional delivery and learning materials influence students' experiences, regular faculty training on gender-responsive pedagogy, inclusive language, and classroom climate management becomes necessary. This supports literature emphasizing that gender responsiveness depends not only on policy but also on teaching practice and educator preparedness.

Third, the framework emphasizes inclusive participation because students strongly perceived leadership and academic opportunities as open to all genders. Sustaining these perceptions requires institutional support for equitable participation in student organizations, classroom leadership, academic activities, and decision-making structures.

Fourth, the communication and campus culture component emerged from the significant relationship between gender sensitivity and lower levels of discomfort. The findings suggest that respectful communication and visible institutional sensitivity may contribute to safer student experiences. Institutionalizing gender-fair language and inclusive communication practices across manuals, orientations, and digital platforms may therefore reinforce positive campus climate.

Finally, the monitoring and evaluation component was informed by the finding that awareness alone does not automatically eliminate experiences of discomfort or discrimination. This indicates the need for regular campus climate assessments, evidence-based program evaluation, and continuous review of institutional GAD initiatives. Systematic monitoring may help institutions identify emerging concerns and ensure that gender-responsive policies translate into meaningful student experiences.

CONCLUSION

The study examined students' gender awareness, gender sensitivity, and experiences of discrimination as indicators of institutional gender responsiveness in higher education. The findings show that students generally demonstrate high awareness of gender-related concerns and favorable perceptions of gender-sensitive practices within the institution. However, the results also indicate that awareness and positive perceptions do not fully eliminate discomfort, stereotypes, or experiences of discrimination within campus life.

The study further revealed that instructional materials, classroom practices, and peer interactions remain important contexts in which gender-related discomfort may occur. The significant relationship between gender awareness and gender sensitivity suggests that awareness contributes to more gender-sensitive perceptions. In contrast, the negative relationship between gender sensitivity and discomfort experiences indicates the value of inclusive institutional environments.

Overall, the findings underscore the importance of evidence-based, continuously monitored GAD initiatives in higher education. Institutional gender responsiveness appears to be strengthened not only by formal policies but also by curriculum practices, faculty engagement, inclusive communication, and a supportive campus culture.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The study is limited by its single-institution design and reliance on self-reported survey responses, which may be influenced by recall bias or social desirability bias. The respondents were also limited to first-year students; thus, the findings may not fully represent the experiences and perceptions of students from other year levels or institutions.

Future research may include multiple higher education institutions to allow broader comparison of gender-responsive practices across contexts. Studies may also incorporate faculty, staff, and administrators to provide a more comprehensive institutional assessment. Further research using regression analysis or structural modeling may help identify stronger predictors of gender sensitivity and experiences of discrimination in higher education settings.

References

- Arcilla, R. A. L., Alfaro, J. O., Diwa, M. J. P., Medina, M. G. I., Rivera, J. M. R., Velasco, J. M. L., & Villanueva, R. L. D. (2022). Gender sensitivity, awareness, and responsiveness of preservice teachers towards GAD-integrated teaching pedagogy. *International Journal of Academic Multidisciplinary Research*, 6(8), 118–127.
- Bustamante-Mora, A., Diéguez-Rebolledo, M., Hormazábal, Y., Valdés, Y., & Vidal, E. (2024). Policies, projects, and initiatives for sustainable higher education with gender equity: A literature review and case study—Universidad de La Frontera. *Sustainability*, 16(12), 5038. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16125038>
- Cagang, A. J., Sinang, A., Butlig, S. P. Q., & Española, E. (2023). Gender and development awareness among pre-service teachers towards gender-sensitive pedagogical practices: A basis for a university GAD program. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 49(3), 266–280. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2023/v49i31153>
- Chapin, J. (2020). *Gender-responsive pedagogy in higher education: A framework paper*. INASP. <https://www.inasp.info/sites/default/files/2021-01/Gender%20responsive%20pedagogy%20Framework%20paper.pdf>
- Commission on Higher Education. (2015). *CHED Memorandum Order No. 01, series of 2015: Establishing the policies and guidelines on Gender and Development in the Commission on Higher Education and higher education institutions*. <https://legacy.ched.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/CMO-NO.-1-S.-2015.pdf>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Khalil, N. (2024). Teacher educators' perspectives on gender responsive pedagogy in higher education in Palestine. *Irish Educational Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2023.2174575>
- Luna, K. D., & Dominguez, J. P. (2022). Gender awareness and sensitivity among college students in Northern Luzon: Basis for institutional programs. *Journal of Human and Social Development*, 14(1), 55–68.
- Morris, C. (2022). Gender back on the agenda in higher education. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31(1), 90–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.1952064>
- Morley, L., & Crossouard, B. (2016). Gender in the neoliberalised global academy: The affective economy of women and leadership in South Asia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 37(1), 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2015.1100529>
- Murtagh, E., Calderón, A., Scanlon, D., & MacPhail, A. (2025). Learning in motion! Design of an evidence-based professional learning programme to support gender-responsive pedagogy in higher education. *Professional Development in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2422585>

- Pérez Huber, L., et al. (2023). Racial and gender microaggressions in college classrooms. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 35(1), 34–52.
- Remigio, M. T. R., & Talosa, A. D. (2021). Student's general attitude toward gender-inclusive language. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 10(3), 864–870. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i3.21573>
- Republic Act No. 9710. (2009). *Magna Carta of Women*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2009/08/14/republic-act-no-9710>
- Republic Act No. 11313. (2019). *Safe Spaces Act*. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/2019/04/17/republic-act-no-11313>
- Saadat, Z. (2022). Review of factors affecting gender disparity in higher education. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1), 2076794. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2022.2076794>
- Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- UNESCO. (2015). *A guide for gender equality in teacher education policy and practices*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- UNESCO. (2019). *From access to empowerment: UNESCO strategy for gender equality in and through education 2019–2025*. UNESCO. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000369000>
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Goal 5: Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal5>
- Unterhalter, E. (2022). Gender and intersecting inequalities in education. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 23(2), 295–315. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2022.2090523>