

# Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy: An Assessment

**Mechell T. Nason**

Student, Medina College – Ozamiz City

**Abstract**— This study assessed the effectiveness of the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy in fostering an inclusive and equitable learning environment. Gender-responsive education policies aim to address disparities in access, participation, and learning outcomes by promoting gender-sensitive curricula, teacher training, and inclusive school governance. Using a descriptive research design, the study employed a researcher-made questionnaire administered to 103 teachers, with data analyzed through arithmetic mean, standard deviation, and the Kruskal-Wallis test. Results revealed that the majority of respondents were female (66.99%) and had over 15 years of teaching experience (38.83%). The overall implementation of the policy was rated high ( $M = 4.129$ ), with the gender-sensitive curriculum ( $M = 4.454$ ) and gender-fair learning environments ( $M = 4.265$ ) receiving the highest ratings. Other components, such as capacity building, prevention of gender-based violence, and stakeholder engagement, were also positively rated. A significant difference in implementation was observed based on educational attainment ( $p = 0.023$ ), while no significant differences were found in relation to sex ( $p = 0.636$ ), age ( $p = 0.741$ ), or teaching experience ( $p = 0.429$ ). These findings highlight the importance of strong policy enforcement, continuous teacher training, and institutional support in achieving the goals of gender-responsive education.

**Keywords**— Gender-responsive education, basic education policy, gender-sensitive curriculum, policy implementation, education equity.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### **Background of the Study**

Gender-responsive education policies aim at the creation of an inclusive and equitable learning environment by addressing gender differences in access, participation, and learning outcomes in basic education. These policies focus most on integrating gender sensitivity into curricula, teacher training, learning materials, and school administration to ensure equal opportunities for all learners. It demands a systematic evaluation of the effect of these policies, taking into account different factors such as policy implementation, teachers' attitudes and awareness, students' perceptions, and support systems within the institution. Policy enforcement, cultural norms, and resource allocation are some of the factors that can play a major role in the success of gender-responsive education. This study tries to evaluate the degree to which gender-responsive policies make basic education more inclusive and effective by examining such factors.

Gender-responsive education policies promote inclusivity and equal opportunities within the basic education system. Based on Department of Education (DepEd) Order No. 32, s. 2017, the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy seeks to integrate gender sensitivity into curricula, pedagogy, and administrative practices to avoid gender-based discrimination in schools (DepEd, 2017). Galamgam, Bautista, and

Rosario (2021) emphasized the positive impact of the policy in promoting a more inclusive learning environment through the promotion of gender-equitable instructional materials and teacher professional development. Similarly, Famela (2024) wrote about various efforts implemented in the Philippine basic education system, citing the need for institutional support, capacity-building activities, and community involvement in enhancing gender-responsive education. These studies emphasize the need for sustained efforts to integrate gender considerations in all sectors of the education system, hence promoting a more inclusive and empowering learning experience for all learners.

The initial observation and interview revealed stark gaps and shortcomings in the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy rollout. Although the policy aims to be inclusive and offer equal opportunity to all students, numerous schools are faced with challenges in integrating it successfully due to a lack of awareness, inadequate teacher training, and lack of robust monitoring systems. Teachers and school administrators indicated difficulties in addressing gender stereotypes ingrained in curriculum materials, classroom environment, and co-curricular activities, leading to variations in the rollout of the policy. Resource limitation, such as the lack of gender-sensitive textbooks and inefficient support programs for vulnerable students, further hinders its effectiveness. The gaps

necessitate more effective rollout strategies, capacity-building interventions, and constant monitoring to ensure gender responsiveness in basic education goes beyond policy formulation and is instead realized as a functioning practice in schools.

This research study attempts to assess the implementation of the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy (DO 32, s. 2017) in the chosen schools in light of its effectiveness in promoting gender equality and inclusivity in basic education. Specifically, it examines the extent to which schools have integrated gender-fair learning environments, gender-sensitive curricula, teacher capacity building in gender and development (GAD), prevention and response to gender-based violence (GBV), and stakeholder participation for gender equality promotion. The study also aims to find out whether the level of policy implementation varies based on the demographic profile of the participants, including sex, age, level of education, and years of teaching experience. By identifying gaps and challenges in policy implementation, this study aims to contribute evidence-based recommendations that can strengthen the effectiveness of gender-responsive education programs, thus promoting an inclusive and equitable learning environment for all learners.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### *Research Design*

This study employed a descriptive research design to assess the implementation of the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy (DO 32, s. 2017) in selected schools. Descriptive research, as defined by Creswell (2014), systematically gathers quantifiable data to describe characteristics, behaviors, or processes without manipulating variables. This design is appropriate for evaluating the extent of policy implementation, identifying gaps, and examining how demographic factors may influence the adoption of gender-responsive practices in education.

### *Research Environment*

The study was conducted in the District of Kolambugan, Lanao del Norte, a culturally diverse fourth-class municipality in Northern Mindanao, Philippines. Comprising 26 barangays, Kolambugan is known for its agricultural economy, natural resources, and commitment to education and sustainable development. With a population that speaks Maranao, Cebuano, Binukid, and Tagalog, the district presents a rich cultural context that influences local educational policies.

Schools in the area serve students from various socioeconomic backgrounds, making it a suitable setting to assess the implementation of gender-responsive basic education policies. The municipality's focus on inclusivity, gender equality, and education improvement supports the relevance of evaluating these policies' effectiveness and identifying implementation challenges.

### *Research Respondents*

The respondents of this study were 103 teachers from the District of Kolambugan, Division of Lanao del Norte, who were directly involved in implementing the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy (DO 32, s. 2017) in their schools. Stratified random sampling was used to ensure fair representation across various school levels, teaching experiences, and demographic profiles. Eligible participants had at least one year of teaching experience and had engaged in school-level activities related to gender equality and inclusivity, while newly hired teachers or those with no such involvement were excluded.

### *Research Instrument*

This study used a structured survey questionnaire as the primary research instrument to assess the implementation of the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy (DO 32, s. 2017) in selected schools. The tool consisted of two parts: the first gathered demographic data, including sex, age, educational attainment, and years of teaching experience; the second assessed the extent of policy implementation across five areas, namely gender-fair learning environment, gender-sensitive curriculum, teacher capacity development on gender and development, prevention and response to gender-based violence, and stakeholder engagement. Responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale from 1 (not implemented) to 5 (strongly implemented). The self-administered questionnaire provided reliable and valid quantitative data for evaluating the policy's implementation.

### *Instruments Validation*

To ensure the reliability and validity of the survey questionnaire, the instrument underwent content validation, face validation, and pilot testing. Content validation was conducted by experts in education, gender studies, and policy implementation, who reviewed the questionnaire for relevance, clarity, and alignment with the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy (DO 32, s. 2017). Their feedback guided necessary revisions. Face validation followed, involving

a small group of teachers who assessed the clarity, readability, and logical flow of the items, leading to further refinements. A pilot test was then conducted with 30 teachers from schools not included in the actual study to evaluate internal consistency using Cronbach's Alpha, with a reliability coefficient of 0.70 or higher deemed acceptable. Based on the results, unclear or low-performing items were revised or removed, ensuring the finalized questionnaire was valid and reliable for data collection.

### Data Gathering Procedure

The data-gathering procedure began by securing formal approval from DepEd officials, school principals, and relevant stakeholders, followed by an orientation session with respondents to explain the study's purpose, confidentiality measures, and voluntary participation. Informed consent was obtained prior to data collection, which involved surveys, interviews, and document analysis. Survey questionnaires were distributed to teachers, administrators, and students to assess awareness and implementation of gender-responsive policies, while key informant interviews with school heads provided deeper insights into challenges and effectiveness. Relevant school records and documents were also reviewed, and all data were systematically organized and analyzed to ensure accurate and meaningful interpretation.

### Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations were strictly observed to ensure fairness, integrity, and respect for respondents' rights

throughout the study. Informed consent was obtained after clearly explaining the study's purpose and procedures, and participation remained voluntary, with the right to withdraw at any time. Confidentiality and anonymity were preserved by securely storing data and removing identifying details. The study also safeguarded respondents from harm by carefully designing culturally appropriate and sensitive instruments, especially considering the potentially sensitive nature of gender-related topics. Bias was minimized, and findings were reported truthfully, upholding transparency and compliance with institutional and legal ethical guidelines in line with Bryman and Bell (2007).

### Data Analysis

The data collected in this study were analyzed using frequency count and percentage to describe the respondents' demographic profiles, including sex, age, educational attainment, and years of teaching experience. Arithmetic mean and standard deviation were used to assess the average level and variability of policy implementation across five key areas: gender-fair learning environment, gender-sensitive curriculum, capacity development, gender-based violence response, and stakeholder engagement. The Kruskal-Wallis H test, a non-parametric method, was applied to determine significant differences in implementation levels across demographic groups. These statistical tools provided a structured and reliable analysis for drawing valid conclusions and recommendations.

## III. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

*Table 1. Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

Profile	f	%
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	19	18.45
Female	69	66.99
Prefer not to say	15	14.56
<b>Total</b>	103	100.00
<b>Age</b>		
20-29 years old	13	12.62
30-39 years old	32	31.07
40-49 years old	33	32.04
50 years old and above	25	24.27
<b>Total</b>	103	100.00
<b>Educational Attainment</b>		
Bachelor's Degree	35	33.98
Master's Units	58	56.31

<b>Master's Degree</b>	10	9.71
<b>Doctorate Units</b>	0	0
<b>Doctorate Degree</b>	0	0
<b>Total</b>	103	100.00
<b>Teaching Experience</b>		
<b>Less than 5 years</b>	16	15.53
<b>5–10 years</b>	33	32.04
<b>11–15 years</b>	14	13.59
<b>More than 15 years</b>	40	38.83
<b>Total</b>	103	100.00

The data presented in Table 1 provides a comprehensive overview of the demographic characteristics of the respondents involved in the study. It covers four main categories: sex, age, educational attainment, and teaching experience.

In terms of sex, the majority of the respondents are female, accounting for 69 or 66.99 percent of the sample. A smaller proportion are male, with 19 or 18.45 percent. Meanwhile, 15 respondents or 14.56 percent preferred not to disclose their sex. This distribution highlights a predominance of female respondents, which may influence the perspectives on gender-responsive policies in basic education.

Regarding age, the respondents were distributed across four age groups. The largest group is aged between 40 and 49 years old, making up 33 or 32.04 percent of the sample. This is followed closely by the 30 to 39 years old group, which represents 32 or 31.07 percent. The age group of 50 years and above includes 25 respondents, or 24.27 percent, while 13 or 12.62 percent of respondents are aged between 20 and 29 years. The distribution indicates that the majority of respondents are in their middle age, which may suggest a wealth of teaching experience and a deeper understanding of the challenges and needs for gender-responsive education policies.

In terms of educational attainment, the majority of respondents have completed Master's units, with 58 respondents or 56.31 percent falling into this category. The next largest group consists of those who hold a Bachelor's degree, comprising 35 or 33.98 percent of the sample. Only 10 respondents or 9.71 percent have obtained a Master's degree, and none have completed Doctorate units or degrees. This suggests that the respondents are relatively well-educated, with most having completed at least some graduate-level coursework, which is important for evaluating the implementation and understanding of advanced educational policies.

The teaching experience of the respondents also varies. A significant number, 40 respondents or 38.83 percent, have more than 15 years of teaching experience. This is followed by 33 respondents or 32.04 percent with 5 to 10 years of experience. A smaller group, 16 respondents or 15.53 percent, have less than 5 years of experience, while 14 respondents or 13.59 percent have 11 to 15 years of experience. This distribution indicates that a majority of respondents have considerable experience in the teaching profession, which can provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of gender-responsive policies in basic education based on practical, real-world knowledge.

**Table 2.1** Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation in terms of Gender-fair Learning Environment

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. My classroom is free from gender stereotypes in language and materials.	0.71	4.55
2. My school promotes equal participation of all genders in academic and extracurricular activities.	0.49	4.68
3. My school ensures non-discrimination based on gender.	0.54	4.63
4. My school provides safe spaces and facilities (e.g., gender-neutral restrooms).	1.05	4.09
5. I have received training to avoid gender bias in my classroom interactions.	0.93	3.98
Average Mean	4.265	Very High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.1 presents the extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy implementation in terms of a gender-fair learning environment, with an overall mean of 4.27, interpreted as Very High. This indicates that schools are effectively creating inclusive and equitable learning environments that support all genders.

The highest-rated indicator is “equal participation of all genders in academic and extracurricular activities” with a mean of 4.68, highlighting strong institutional efforts in promoting gender equality in student engagement. The lowest-rated indicator is “training to avoid gender bias in classroom interactions”, which obtained a mean

of 3.98. Although the lowest, it still falls under the High category, suggesting that while there is room for growth in capacity-building efforts, educators are already showing commendable awareness and initiative toward gender-fair teaching practices.

These findings are consistent with UNESCO (2019), which underscores the need for both robust policies and continuous teacher training in building truly gender-responsive educational systems. This suggests that institutional commitment, when paired with targeted professional development, can lead to meaningful improvements in classroom inclusivity.

**Table 2.2** Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation in terms of Gender-Sensitive Curriculum

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I integrate gender equality and inclusivity in my lessons.	0.62	4.50
2. The learning materials I use (books, visuals, etc.) are free from gender bias.	0.68	4.53
3. I use gender-sensitive language in my instruction.	0.62	4.48
4. I include discussions on gender issues and rights in my teaching.	0.75	4.42
5. My teaching strategies promote gender inclusivity in all subject areas.	0.79	4.35
Average Mean		4.454 Very High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.2 presents the extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy implementation in terms of a gender-sensitive curriculum, with an overall mean of 4.45, which is interpreted as Very High. This demonstrates that educators consistently apply gender-sensitive approaches in their teaching, reflecting a strong commitment to fostering equality and inclusivity in the classroom.

The highest-rated indicator is “The learning materials I use (books, visuals, etc.) are free from gender bias” with a mean of 4.53, highlighting teachers’ careful selection of unbiased resources. The lowest-rated indicator is “My teaching strategies promote gender inclusivity in all subject areas”, which received a mean of 4.35. Despite

being the lowest, this score is still very high, indicating that educators are effectively promoting inclusivity while also identifying opportunities to further develop inclusive teaching strategies across all subjects.

UNESCO (2019) emphasizes the importance of integrating gender-sensitive content and pedagogy to achieve a truly equitable learning environment.

This implies that deliberate instructional planning and the use of inclusive content are critical in reinforcing gender equity in day-to-day classroom interactions. The strong results suggest that schools are successfully embedding gender responsiveness within curriculum and instructional practices.

**Table 2.3** Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation in terms of Capacity Development of Teachers and School Personnel on Gender and Development (GAD)

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. I have attended gender sensitivity training provided by my school.	1.01	3.90
2. I am knowledgeable about gender-responsive teaching strategies.	0.75	4.17
3. School personnel undergo orientation on gender policies and issues.	0.86	4.04
4. Gender mainstreaming is actively promoted in school programs and activities.	0.81	4.17
5. There is a designated focal person or committee for gender-related concerns in the school.	0.88	4.13
Average Mean		4.083 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.3 shows the extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy implementation regarding capacity development of teachers and school personnel on Gender and Development, with an overall mean of 4.08, interpreted as High. This indicates that schools are effectively supporting educators through training and orientations to promote gender-responsive practices.

The highest-rated indicators are “I am knowledgeable about gender-responsive teaching strategies” and “Gender mainstreaming is actively promoted in school programs and activities”, both with a mean of 4.17, reflecting strong teacher preparedness and institutional commitment. The lowest-rated indicator is “I have

attended gender sensitivity training provided by my school” with a mean of 3.90, which, while lower, remains positively rated as High, suggesting ongoing efforts to increase participation in such trainings.

These findings align with research by Lomibao (2024), which highlights the importance of continuous capacity building and institutional support in effectively mainstreaming gender responsiveness within schools.

This suggests that while foundational efforts are in place, sustained training opportunities are essential to fully equip educators with the skills and confidence to apply gender-responsive approaches in diverse contexts.

**Table 2.4** Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation in terms of Prevention and Response to Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in Schools

Indicators	Sd	Mean
1. The school has clear policies and mechanisms to prevent gender-based violence.	0.88	4.16
2. A reporting and response system is in place for cases of gender-based violence.	0.86	4.11
3. Students and staff receive awareness training on gender-based violence.	0.85	4.04
4. The school collaborates with authorities in handling gender-based violence cases.	0.85	4.18
5. Counseling and support services are available for victims of gender-based violence.	0.79	4.21
<b>Average Mean</b>		4.140 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.4 presents the extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy implementation in terms of prevention and response to gender-based violence (GBV) in schools, with an overall mean of 4.14, interpreted as High. This indicates that schools are actively implementing policies and mechanisms to create safe and supportive environments for all learners.

The highest-rated indicator is “Counseling and support services are available for victims of gender-based violence” with a mean of 4.21, reflecting strong emphasis on victim assistance and psychosocial care. The lowest-rated indicator is “Students and staff receive

awareness training on gender-based violence” with a mean of 4.04, which, although the lowest, is still High, suggesting that while training efforts are ongoing, expanding their reach could further strengthen awareness.

These findings correspond with Marcus (2024), which highlights the critical role of comprehensive prevention and response systems in effectively addressing GBV in educational settings. The results show that schools are committed to safeguarding their communities, with opportunities for continuous improvement in training programs.

**Table 2.5** Extent of Implementation on Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy in terms of Strengthening Partnerships and Stakeholder Engagement for Gender Equality

Indicators	Sd	Mean
The school actively involves parents in gender-responsive initiatives.	0.89	4.03
The school collaborates with local government and NGOs on gender-related programs.	0.84	4.09
Gender-responsive policies are effectively communicated to all stakeholders.	0.84	4.05
There is active community participation in promoting gender equality in schools.	0.85	4.02
The school conducts outreach activities promoting gender equality beyond the school environment.	0.92	3.96
<b>Average Mean</b>		4.029 High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.5 shows the extent of implementation of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy in terms of strengthening partnerships and stakeholder engagement for gender equality, with an overall mean of 4.03, interpreted as High. This indicates that schools are actively involving stakeholders and building collaborations that support gender equality initiatives.

The highest-rated indicator is “The school collaborates with local government and NGOs on gender-related programs” with a mean of 4.09, highlighting strong external partnerships that bolster gender equality efforts. The lowest-rated indicator is “The school conducts

outreach activities promoting gender equality beyond the school environment” with a mean of 3.96, which remains positively rated as High, suggesting room to further expand outreach and advocacy beyond the school community.

These findings align with Lomibao (2024), which emphasizes the importance of multi-sectoral partnerships and community engagement in sustaining gender-responsive educational programs. The results reflect schools’ commitment to collaborative and inclusive approaches to gender equality.

**Table 2.6** Summary of the Extent of Implementation on Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy

Components	Mean	Interpretation
Gender-fair learning environment	4.265	Very High
Gender-sensitive curriculum	4.454	Very High
Capacity development of teachers and school personnel on gender and development (GAD)	4.083	High
Prevention and response to gender-based violence (GBV) in schools	4.140	High
Strengthening partnerships and stakeholder engagement for gender equality	4.029	High
Average Mean	4.129	High

Scale: 1.0 – 1.80 “Very Low”, 1.81 – 2.60 “Low”, 2.61 – 3.40 “Average”, 3.41 – 4.20 “High” 4.21 – 5.00 “Very High”

Table 2.6 presents the summary of the extent of implementation on Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy. The overall mean of 4.129 indicates a High level of implementation across the assessed components. This suggests that while gender-responsive approaches in basic education are well-practiced, there remains room for further enhancement. The high average mean reflects a positive institutional commitment to gender equality, with significant progress made but additional efforts needed to reach the highest responsiveness.

Among the five components, the highest mean of 4.454 is observed in Gender-sensitive curriculum, indicating strong integration of gender perspectives in learning materials and teaching strategies. Gender-fair learning environment follows with a mean of 4.265, reflecting an inclusive and respectful atmosphere free from gender bias. The other components, Capacity development of

teachers and school personnel on gender and development with a mean of 4.083, Prevention and response to gender-based violence in schools with a mean of 4.140, and Strengthening partnerships and stakeholder engagement for gender equality with a mean of 4.029, all rated High, demonstrate active efforts in professional development, protective mechanisms, and collaborative engagements. These ratings suggest ongoing initiatives that could be expanded and deepened to sustain and enhance gender responsiveness across all areas.

These findings align with UNESCO (2019), which emphasizes that comprehensive implementation requires sustained training, effective prevention programs, and broad stakeholder collaboration to build fully gender-responsive educational systems.

**Table 3.** Test of Significant Difference in the Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation According to Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Variables	df	P value	Decision
Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation Vs. sex	2	0.636	retain the Ho
Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation Vs. age	3	0.741	retain the Ho

<b>Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation Vs. Educational Attainment</b>	2	0.023	reject the Ho
<b>Extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy Implementation Vs. Length of Service</b>	3	0.429	retain the Ho

Note: If  $p \leq 0.05$ , with a significant difference

Table 3 shows the test of significant difference in the extent of Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy implementation based on the respondents' demographic profile.

The results reveal that the extent of policy implementation does not significantly differ when grouped by sex, with a p-value of 0.636, which is greater than the 0.05 significance level. This indicates that both male and female respondents have similar perceptions regarding the implementation of gender-responsive policies.

Similarly, when grouped by age, the p-value is 0.741, also exceeding the 0.05 threshold. This means there is no significant difference in how respondents of different age groups perceive the policy's implementation, reflecting a consistent understanding across ages.

However, a significant difference is found in relation to educational attainment, with a p-value of 0.023, which is below the 0.05 cutoff.

This suggests that respondents with different levels of education perceive the extent of policy implementation differently.

Those with higher educational qualifications may have greater awareness or a more critical perspective on the implementation of gender-responsive policies.

Lastly, the comparison based on length of service shows a p-value of 0.429, above 0.05, indicating no significant difference. This implies that the number of years respondents have served does not affect their views on how the policy is implemented.

In summary, perceptions of gender-responsive policy implementation are generally consistent across sex, age, and length of service.

However, educational attainment influences these perceptions, highlighting the need for ongoing professional development and gender-sensitivity training for all educators to foster a uniform understanding and stronger commitment to gender-responsive practices in education.

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION

### Summary of Findings

1. **Demographic Profile.** The majority of the respondents were female, comprising 66.99 percent of the sample. The most common age group was 40 to 49 years old, representing 32.04 percent. In terms of educational attainment, most respondents had earned master's units, accounting for 56.31 percent. Regarding teaching experience, the largest group had more than 15 years of service, with 38.83 percent.
2. The overall extent of implementation of the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy was rated as high, with an average mean of 4.129. Among the components assessed, the gender-sensitive curriculum received the highest rating with a mean of 4.454, interpreted as very high, followed by the gender-fair learning environment with a mean of 4.265, also very high. The remaining components, including capacity development of teachers and school personnel on gender and development, prevention and response to gender-based violence in schools, and strengthening partnerships and stakeholder engagement for gender equality, were all rated high, with mean scores of 4.083, 4.140, and 4.029, respectively.
3. **Significant Difference in Implementation Based on Demographic Profile.** A significant difference was observed in the extent of policy implementation when respondents were grouped according to educational attainment, with a p-value of 0.023. However, no significant differences were found based on sex ( $p = 0.636$ ), age ( $p = 0.741$ ), or length of teaching experience ( $p = 0.429$ ).

### Conclusion

The implementation of the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy in the selected schools is notably effective, with very high levels observed in creating gender-fair learning environments and integrating gender-sensitive curricula. While capacity development, prevention and response to gender-based violence, and stakeholder engagement also show strong implementation, there remains room for enhancement. The findings reveal that perceptions of policy

implementation do not significantly vary by sex, age, or length of service but do differ according to educational attainment. This indicates that educators with higher qualifications may have greater awareness or understanding of gender-responsive practices. To ensure consistent and comprehensive policy implementation, ongoing professional development and targeted training are essential to deepen knowledge and commitment among all education personnel.

## Recommendations

1. Department of Education (DepEd). DepEd is encouraged to sustain and enhance gender-sensitive curriculum efforts by providing continuous training and accessible resources for teachers. Targeted capacity-building programs, particularly for teachers with lower educational attainment, would help ensure consistent implementation. Strengthening support systems and institutionalizing gender-based violence (GBV) prevention measures across all educational levels is also essential.
2. School Administrators. Administrators may consider assessing their school's adherence to gender-responsive policies and prioritize teacher development through gender-sensitivity training. Enhancing the school climate by ensuring safe spaces and establishing effective GBV reporting systems will further promote inclusivity.
3. Teachers. Teachers are encouraged to deepen their practice of gender-sensitive pedagogy by attending relevant workshops and integrating gender-inclusive strategies in teaching. Collaboration with administrators in fostering safe, respectful classrooms can support sustained implementation.
4. Students. Students should be engaged in gender-awareness activities to cultivate respect and understanding within the school environment. Peer education programs may be helpful in promoting inclusivity and shared responsibility among learners.
5. Parents and Guardians. Active parental involvement in promoting gender sensitivity at home is vital. Schools may consider organizing awareness drives or parenting workshops to strengthen support for gender equality initiatives both in school and beyond.
6. GAD Advocates and Organizations. GAD advocates can use the findings to guide their collaborations with schools in conducting trainings and offering resources. Their support is key in

addressing GBV and promoting inclusive policies in both educational and community settings.

7. Policymakers and Government Agencies. Policymakers may take this study into account when refining gender-responsive policies and ensuring nationwide consistency in implementation. Continuous investment in capacity-building programs and GBV prevention initiatives remains essential.
8. Community Stakeholders and NGOs. Community actors and NGOs are encouraged to support school-based gender equality programs and advocacy. Partnerships aimed at GBV prevention, support services, and policy awareness can enhance the broader impact of these initiatives.
9. Future Researchers. Future studies may delve deeper into regional implementations of gender-responsive education and the influence of demographic variables. Research into best practices and barriers to effective policy integration can inform more refined interventions in the future.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abbas, M., & Hannan, A. (2022). Seminars' impact on teacher growth: A longitudinal study. *Pedagogy in Practice*, 26(1), 99-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02913035.2022.1886231>
- [2] Anim-Wright, K. (2024). Examining the effect of Department of Education (DepEd). (2017). Department Order No. 32, s. 2017: Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy. Retrieved from [https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/DO\\_s2017\\_032.pdf](https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/DO_s2017_032.pdf)
- [3] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- [4] Department of Education (DepEd). (2017). DO 32, s. 2017 – Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy.
- [5] Famela, Q. (2024). Gender responsiveness in the Philippine basic education context: Priority thrusts and initiatives in the Schools Division of Batangas City. *J. Electrical Systems*, 20(5s), 882-903.
- [6] Galamgam, M. A., Bautista, J. O. W. A. R. A., & Rosario, E. (2021). An analysis on the implementation of gender-responsive Basic Education Policy. *The ASTR Journal*, 5(1), 1-1.
- [7] Lomibao, C. R. D. (2024). Implementation of gender-responsive basic education policy in the secondary public schools. *International Journal of*

Research in Social Sciences and Humanities,  
10(12), 5831–5871.  
<https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803438S>

- [8] Marcus, R. (2024). How can education systems help prevent gender-based violence? ALIGN. <https://www.alignplatform.org/resources/how-can-education-systems-help-prevent-gender-based-violence>
- [9] UNESCO. (2019). Strategy for gender equality in and through education (2019-2025). Retrieved from <https://en.unesco.org/themes/women-s-and-girls-education>

