AWARENESS, PRACTICES, AND IMPLEMENTATION OF GENDER AND DEVELOPMENT AMONG STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Enriqueta N. Siva
enriqueta.siva@gsc.edu.ph

ABSTRACT This study assessed the awareness, practices, and implementation in terms of the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanisms, and programs/activities/projects of Gender and Development (GAD) among State Universities and Colleges in Region VI, Philippines for the academic year 2016-2017. The respondents of the study were the selected faculty and staff applying descriptive method as the research design in gathering data. The researcher made instrument was utilized after thorough validations of experts using Good and Scates 8 point agenda and reliability test using the Cronbach's alpha and the statistical tools used and setting level of significance at 0.05 alpha was prioritized. It found out that the respondents were highly aware, often practiced, and just implemented in terms of the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanisms, and programs/activities/projects. There were significant differences on the awareness when grouped according to SUC level, type of SUC, population, age, sex, civil status, religion, and employment status while no significant observed in terms of category, length of service, and educational attainment. There were significant differences on the practices when grouped according to SUC level, type of SUC, population, age, sex, civil status, and religion while no significant differences observed in terms of category, employment status, length of service, and educational attainment. There were significant differences on the implementation when grouped according to SUC level, type of SUC, population, age, sex, civil status, religion, and employment status while no significant observed in terms of category, length of service, and educational attainment. Lastly, there were significant relationship between the awareness, practices, and implementation.

Keywords: Awareness, Practices, Implementation, Gender and Development, State Universities and Colleges

INTRODUCTION

Most of the countries are worried about gender inequality in society. In the Philippines, even though the country has a good record when it comes to gender equality, it is important to reach the widest possible audience (Sumasad and Tuazon, 2016). Article XIII, Section 14 says women need to have a say in how things work in the world. The Philippines is at the top of a list of countries with good records on gender equality in part because the country has a lot of good institutions in place to promote gender equality (MacPhail, 2015). It has been said that GAD looks at gender roles and social relations; how men and women show their "maleness" and "femininess" in their access to resources. However, there is a glass ceiling, which means that there is a lot of opposition to women and minorities becoming managers in large organizations (Fritcher, 2017).

It was also thought that women were less productive because they would take a long time off work after having a child. Because women can see through the glass, they may be able to see where they could go, but they can't reach the ceiling, which leads to unfairness and discrimination. In the end, this led to efforts to include gender and development themes in government agencies and universities. In this study, the learned about the social aspects of hierarchical power relations that are built into social institutions, as well as how they affect men and women in society. After that, the survey asked about the awareness and implementation of GAD in the SUCs of Region 6. The results of this study can now be used to make changes to the Gender and Development Program Plan at State Universities and Colleges in Region VI, where this study took place.

In general, this study was conducted to assess the awareness, practices, and implementation of Gender and Development (GAD) when grouped according to SUC profile and respondent's profile in terms of the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanisms, and programs/activities/projects among State Universities and Colleges in Region VI. No significant differences were likewise hypothesized. Hence, this study was conducted.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed descriptive research design that involved survey which describes the status quo, correlation studies which investigate the relationship between variables and developmental studies which seek to determine changes over time (Key, 2016). There are five provinces and this study was conducted in the identified eight (8) selected SUCs in region VI. The respondents were the randomly selected faculty and staff of the different SUCs in Region VI for AY 2016-2017 and determined by using Slovin's formula. A modified instrument was used based from the Gender Mainstreaming Evaluation Framework in gathering the data that undergone experts' validation using the Good and Scates Eight- Point Criteria for Validation and was subjected to pilot testing. Finally, the data were tallied, tabulated, and prepared for statistical evaluations and interpretations. The responses were encoded, tallied, tabulated, and be subjected for data analysis using SPSS v.17. Appropriate statistical tools were used to answer every specific stated problem. Frequency, percentages, mean, t-test, ANOVA, and Pearson r were utilized.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 presents the level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, type of school, population, age, sex, civil status, religion, category, employment status, length of service, and educational attainment. The entire mean was 3.96, indicating strong awareness. All of these SUCs have a well-established GAD program, in such, SUC level 4 was classified as very highly aware, while levels 1, 2, and 3 were described as highly aware with M=3.87, M=3.61 and M=4.15 accordingly. In terms of school type,College and University are classified as very aware (M=3.59 and M=4.15). The population mean results showed that big (5,000 and above) and small (5,000 an below) are highly aware, with M=4.15 and M=3.60 respectively. The classification of age 3.96 was described as highly aware. M=4.06 in young (36 years and under) and M=3.36 in old (37 years and over). Regarding sex, females and males are equally aware, with M=4.06 and 3.76. In terms of civil status, the results showed that individuals who were single, married, or widowed had M=4.09, M=3.9, and M=3.76. Regarding religion, catholics and non-Catholics had M=4.02 and M=3.69. Furthermore, the results show that both faculty and staff have the same level, M=3.99 and M=3.92. In terms of employment status, both casual and permanent have M=4.06 and are described as highly aware. Those short (10 yrs. and below) and long (11 yrs. and above) have the same level and got the M=3.95 and M=3.97 respectively and described as highly aware in terms of educational attainment, the global mean was 3.96. All bachelor's, master's, PhD/EdD/DM, and other degrees received M=4.00, M=3.97, M=3.85, and M=3.93 accordingly.

Table 1. Awareness on GAD when Classified According to SUC Level, Type of School, Population, Age, Sex, Civil Status, Religion, Category, Employment Status, Length of Service, and Educational Attainment

Profile	Mean	Interpretation
SUC Level		
Level 1	3.87	Highly Aware
Level 2	3.61	Highly Aware
Level 3	4.15	Highly Aware
Level 4	4.35	Very Highly Aware
Type of School		
College	3.59	Highly Aware
University	4.17	Highly Aware
Population		
Small (less than 5000)	3.6	Highly Aware
Big (5000 and above)	4.15	Highly Aware
Age		
Young (36 yrs. and below)	4.06	Highly Aware
Old (37 yrs. and above)	3.36	Highly Aware
Sex		
Male	3.76	Highly Aware
Female	4.06	Highly Aware
Civil Status		
Single	4.09	Highly Aware
Married	3.9	Highly Aware
Widow/er	3.76	Highly Aware
Religion		
Catholic	4.02	Highly Aware
Non Catholic	3.69	Highly Aware
Category		
Faculty	3.99	Highly Aware
Staff	3.92	Highly Aware
Employment Status		
Casual	4.06	Highly Aware
Permanent	3.91	Highly Aware
Length of Service		
Short (10 yrs. and below)	3.95	Highly Aware
Long (11 yrs. and above)	3.97	Highly Aware
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	4.00	Highly Aware
Master's Degree	3.97	Highly Aware
PhD/ Ed.D/ DM	3.85	Highly Aware
Others	3.93	Highly Aware
Overall Mean	3.96	Highly Aware

Scale: 1.00 to 1.80 (Not Aware) 1.81 to 2.60 (Less Aware) 2.61 to 3.40 (Moderately Aware) 3.41 to 4.20 (Highly Aware) 4.21 to 5.00 (Very Highly Aware)

Table 2 presents the level of awareness on the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanisms, and programs/activities/projects. The level of awareness on the key area of GAD policy taken as a whole had a mean M=4.07, described as highly aware. It shows that they were very highly aware (M=4.26) on the policy/s articulating support to GAD mandate. In terms of the key area of people, it shows that they were highly aware (M=3.84). As to the key of GAD Enabling Mechanisms, the mean (M=3.86) determined them to be highly aware. Lastly, as to the programs, activities, and projects, they were also highly aware, (M=3.96).

Understanding how gender roles influence organizational settings can help Velasco & Alicar-Cadorna (2014) deliver gender responsive services (Aspiras et.al, 2017). To which human rights, gender equality, and gender sensitivity will be incorporated into fundamental education and governance (Llego, 2017). Even PH Women's Commission (2011) clarify the GFPS's roles and responsibilities, composition, and structure to enable it to act as a mechanism for promoting Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

Table 2. Awareness on the Key Areas of GAD such as Policy, People, Enabling Mechanisms, and Programs/Activities/Projects

Key Area of GAD	Mean	Interpretation
1. GAD Policies	4.10	Highly Aware
2. GAD People	3.84	Highly Aware
3. Enabling Mechanisms	3.86	Highly Aware
4. GAD Programs/Activities/Projects	3.96	Highly Aware
Awareness on GAD	4.07	Highly Aware

Scale: 1.00 to 1.80 (Not Aware) 1.81 to 2.60 (Less Aware) 2.61 to 3.40 (Moderately Aware) 3.41 to 4.20 (Highly Aware) 4.21 to 5.00 (Very Highly Aware)

Table 3 presents the practices on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, type of school, population, age, sex, civil status, religion, category, employment status, length of service, and educational attainment. The level of practice on GAD had an overall mean of 3.79 and it means that they often practiced. As to SUC level, those in level 1, 3 and 4 often practiced with a mean of M=3.74, M=4.03 and M=4.04 while level 2 sometimes practiced with a mean M=3.35. In terms of type of school, those in college and university often practiced and had M=3.37 and M=4.03 of means. In terms of population, it revealed that majority of big (5,000 and above) were often practice with the mean of 4.02, and small (less than 5,000) were often practiced it too with the mean of 3.36. In terms of age, the overall mean was 3.79 described as often practiced. Those young (36 yrs. and below) and old (37 yrs. and above) have the same level with different means, M=3.91 and M=3.68 respectively and they had often practiced. In terms of sex, both male and female have the same description, as often practiced and got M=3.56 and M=3.91 respectively. In terms of civil status, those single, married and widow/er got M=3.95, M=3.72 and 3.50 respectively and all described as often practiced. In terms of religion, both catholic and non catholic have often practiced, M=3.85 and M=3.53 respectively. In terms of employment status, those casual and permanent have the same scale of means, M=3.89 and M=3.74 respectively and they often practiced it. In terms of length of service, Those short (10 yrs and below) and long (11 yrs and above) have the same level described as often practiced with M=3.78 and M=3.80 respectively. Lastly, in terms of educational attainment, those bachelor's degree, master's degree, PhD/EdD/DM have often practiced with M=3.81, M=3.80, M=3.68, and M=3.99.

Table 3. Practices on GAD when Classified According to SUC Level, Type of School, Population, Age, Sex, Civil Status, Religion, Category, Employment Status, Length of Service, and Educational Attainment

Profile	Mean	Interpretation
SUC Level		
Level 1	3.74	Often Practiced
Level 2	3.35	Sometimes Practiced
Level 3	4.03	Often Practiced
Level 4	4.04	Often Practiced
Type of School		
College	3.37	Often Practiced
University	4.03	Often Practiced
Population		
Small (less than 5000)	3.36	Often Practiced
Big (5000 and above)	4.02	Often Practiced
Age		
Young (36 yrs. and below)	3.91	Often Practiced
Old (37 yrs. and above)	3.68	Often Practiced

Sex		
Male	3.56	Often Practiced
Female	3.91	Often Practiced
Civil Status		
Single	3.95	Often Practiced
Married	3.72	Often Practiced
Widow/er	3.5	Often Practiced
Religion		
Catholic	3.85	Often Practiced
Non Catholic	3.53	Often Practiced
Category		
Faculty	3.85	Often Practiced
Staff	3.73	Often Practiced
Employment Status		
Casual	3.89	Often Practiced
Permanent	3.74	Often Practiced
Length of Service		
Short (10 yrs. and below)	3.78	Often Practiced
Long (11 yrs. and above)	3.8	Often Practiced
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	3.81	Often Practiced
Master's Degree	3.8	Often Practiced
PhD/ Ed.D/ DM	3.68	Often Practiced
Others	3.99	Often Practiced
Overall Mean	3.79	Often Practiced

Scale: 1.00 to 1.80 (Never Practice) 1.81 to 2.60 (Rarely Practice) 2.61 to 3.40 (Sometimes Practice) 3.41 to 4.20 (Often Practice) 4.21 to 5.00 (Always Practice)

Table 4 presents the practices on the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanisms, and programs/activities/projects. In the area of GAD policy, the overall mean was M=3.81 and were described to be often practices. Adopting a GAD Agenda/Strategic Framework was the mostly practiced (M=3.89) and the least practices was reviewing and revising some existing policies pertaining to GAD (M=3.74), yet these practices was did often times. As to key of GAD people, they were often practice it based on the mean (M=3.86). Creating of GAD Focal Point System (GFPS) whose members attended appropriate and relevant training on GAD was mostly practiced often, (M=4.02) while having staff members who are recognized as GAD experts by other organizations was the least practiced (M=3.66). As to the particulars on GAD Enabling Mechanisms, they often practiced it with a mean of 3.72. It shows that creating/reconstituting the GAD Focal Point System or similar GAD mechanism in accordance with MCW and pertinent policies issued by concerned oversight agencies (M=3.80), as the highest mean and establishing other GAD mechanisms contribute to the attainment of desired impact/s (M=3.65) as the lowest mean, were the most and least practices that they did oftentimes. Lastly, the mean of 3.79 on key area of Programs/Activities /Projects determined that they often practiced it. Observing GAD-related events by the organization was one of the particulars that most of them agreed that they often practiced, (M=3.91). Conducting capacity development on GAD to develop internal GAD experts and developing and disseminating IEC materials on GAD for clients (internal and external) had the lowest mean of 3.72 and it speaks that they often practiced it too.

For example, the Asian Development Bank (2017) notes that while the number of gender- mainstreamed initiatives has increased across all sectors, the fraction of successful programs has increased dramatically. While GABRIELA and its member organizations thrived, other national democrat mass organizations withered (Hega et.al, 2017). Unlike David et al. (2017), this study assesses the country's performance on important gender-related variables. So it addresses gender equality, economic opportunity, political voice and leadership, as well as female safety. Also identified are policy priorities for gender equality and women's empowerment. According to Ampong (2017), engage employees and empower them to constantly improve service delivery by identifying gaps in work areas and developing plans to accomplish goals.

Table 4. Practices on the Key Areas of GAD such as Policy, People, Enabling Mechanisms, and Programs/Activities/Projects

Key Area of GAD	Mean	Interpretation
1. GAD Policies	3.81	Often Practice
2. GAD People	3.86	Often Practice
3. Enabling Mechanisms	3.72	Often Practice
4. GAD Programs/Activities/Projects	3.79	Often Practice
Practices on GAD	3.80	Often Practice

Scale: 1.00 - 1.80 (Never Practice) 1.81 - 2.60 (Rarely Practice) 2.61 - 3.40 (Sometimes Practice) 3.41 - 4.20 (Often Practice) 4.21 - 5.00 (Always Practice)

Table 5 presents the extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, type of school, population, age, sex, civil status, religion, category, employment status, length of service, and educational attainment. It shows the degree of GAD implementation in the entire group (M=2.15) described as implemented. In terms of SUC level, level 4 was fully implemented with a mean M=2.47. Levels 1, 2, and 3 have M=2.06, M=1.94, and M=2.27 accordingly, and were all implemented. College and university have the same level implemented with M=1.93 and M=2.27 respectively. In terms of population, both small (under 5,000) and large (5,000 and above) have the same level with M=1.93 and M=2.27. Young (36 years and under) and old (37 years and beyond) have the same level of implementation with M=2.21 and M=2.1. Male and female have implemented the same with M=2.04 and M=2.21. Single, married, and widow/er have the same level specified with M=2.23, M=2.12, and M=2.00. With M=2.19 and M=2.00 for religion, both Catholics and non- Catholics have the same level mentioned. M=2.18 for academics and M=2.12 for employees. In terms of employment status, M=2.23 for casual and M=2.11 for permanent are applied. Short (10 years or less) and long (11 years or more) service levels are implemented using M=2.16 and M=2.11, respectively. The overall mean for educational attainment was 2.15. These are implemented as M=2.15, M=2.17, M=2.14 and M=2.00 for the bachelor's, master's, PhD/EdD/DM, and othersTable 5 presents the extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, type of school, population, age, sex, civil status, religion, category, employment status, length of service, and educational attainment.

It shows the degree of GAD implementation in the entire group (M=2.15) described as implemented. In terms of SUC level, level 4 was fully implemented with a mean M=2.47. Levels 1, 2, and 3 have M=2.06, M=1.94, and M=2.27 accordingly, and were all implemented. College and university have the same level implemented with M=1.93 and M=2.27 respectively. In terms of population, both small (under 5,000) and large (5,000 and above) have the same level with M=1.93 and M=2.27. Young (36 years and under) and old (37 years and beyond) have the same level of implementation with M=2.21 and M=2.1. Male and female have implemented the same with M=2.04 and M=2.21. Single, married, and widow/er have the same level specified with M=2.23, M=2.12, and M=2.00. With M=2.19 and M=2.00 for religion, both Catholics and non- Catholics have the same level mentioned. M=2.18 for academics and M=2.12 for employees. In terms of employment status, M=2.23 for casual and M=2.11 for permanent are applied. Short (10 years or less) and long (11 years or more) service levels are implemented using M=2.16 and M=2.11, respectively. The overall mean for educational attainment was 2.15. These are implemented as M=2.15, M=2.17, M=2.14 and M=2.00 for the bachelor's, master's, PhD/EdD/DM, and others.

Table 5. Implementation on GAD when Classified According to SUC Level, Type of School, Population, Age, Sex, Civil Status, Religion, Category, Employment Status, Length of Service, and Educational Attainment

Profile	Mean	Interpretation
SUC Level		
Level 1	2.06	Implemented
Level 2	1.94	Implemented
Level 3	2.27	Implemented
Level 4	2.47	Fully Implemented
Type of School		
College	1.93	Implemented
University	2.27	Implemented
Population		
Small (less than 5,000)	1.93	Implemented
Big (5,000 and above)	2.27	Implemented
Age		
Young (36 yrs and below)	2.21	Implemented
Old (37 yrs and above)	2.1	Implemented
Sex		
Male	2.04	Implemented
Female	2.21	Implemented
Civil Status		
Single	2.23	Implemented
Married	2.12	Implemented
Widow/er	2	Implemented
Religion		
Catholic	2.19	Implemented
Non Catholic	2	Implemented
Category		
Faculty	2.18	Implemented
Staff	2.12	Implemented

Employment Status		
Casual	2.23	Implemented
Permanent	2.11	Implemented
Length of Service		
Short (10 yrs and below)	2.16	Implemented
Long (11 yrs and above)	2.15	Implemented
Educational Attainment		
Bachelor's Degree	2.15	Implemented
Master's Degree	2.17	Implemented
PhD/ Ed.D/ DM	2.14	Implemented
Others	2	Implemented
Overall Mean	2.15	Implemented

Scale: 1.00 to 1.66 (Not Implemented) 1.67 to 2.33 (Implemented) 2.34 to 3.00 (Fully Implemented)

Table 6 presents the extent of implementation on the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanisms, and programs/activities/projects. As to the GAD policy, the indicators was implemented when taken into entire group (M=2.18). Implementing the policy/policies articulating support to GAD mandates was the highest extent of implementation, (M=2.33) while the least extent of implementation was Has reviewed and revised of some existing policies pertaining to GAD (M=2.08). As to GAD people, the indicators described as implemented when the entire group was taken. Executing the GAD Development Program by sending its top management to the Basic GAD Orientation or Gender Sensitivity Training (GST) with a mean of 2.23, was highest extent of implementation and recognized the Staff members as GAD experts by other organizations with a mean of 2.09 was the least extent of implementation. As to GAD enabling mechanisms, the mean of 2.14 among the entire group was described the indicators as implemented. The highest extent of implementation was Utilized the GAD budget judiciously, (M=2.17) and Engaged in established agencies/lgus, institutions and/or individuals towards the strategic implementation of GAD paps was the least extent of implemention. Lastly, in terms of GAD programs/activities /projects, the mean of 2.15 had described the indicators as implemented. The held of GAD-related events/activities had the highest mean (M=2.26) and described the indicator as implemented. However, implementing the setting-up of GAD corner was the least extent of implementaion (M=2.05), though it described as implemented.

There is even a toolkit from the Department of Energy (2016) that aims to help DOE and its departments as well as other organizations better understand how to deal with the gender issues of their own employees and clients. In connection with this, people who work for the government need to learn more about gender issues and be willing to talk about them in order to appreciate GAD and fight for it in the long run. Like the Commission on Audit kept an eye on government operations to make sure that gender-sensitive policies, programs, projects, and activities are part of the government's everyday work (Castillo, 2017). Meanwhile, an early project by the Galilea Center for Educational Development (2011) shows how gender affects women and men's roles in society, especially in development, as well as how it affects their relationships with each other. It is given to people who don't think about gender very much. There have been a lot of good changes in the Philippine educational system, but this study looked at how gender equality is promoted in higher education (HEI). Gender equality at a Philippine HEI was looked at in this study (Gavino-Gumba, 2013).

Table 6. Implementation on the Key Areas of GAD such as Policy, People, Enabling Mechanisms, and Programs/Activities/Projects

Key Area of GAD	Mean	Interpretation
1. GAD Policies	2.18	Implemented
2. GAD People	2.17	Implemented
3. Enabling Mechanisms	2.14	Implemented
4. GAD Programs/Activities/Projects	2.15	Implemented
Implementation on GAD	2.16	Implemented

Scale: 1.00 to 1.66 (Not Implemented) 1.67 to 2.33 (Implemented) 2.34 to 3.00 (Fully Implemented)

Table 7 presents differences in the level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, category, employment status, and length of service. Results showed that there were significant differences in the level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, and employment status. As to SUC type, it computed t-ratio=-8.903, df=333 and t-probability=0.000. A computed t-ratio=-8.18, df=338 and t-probability=0.000 was determined to the SUC population. As to age, it had computed t-ratio=2.775, df=338 and t- probability=0.006. In terms of sex, it computed t-ratio=-4.011, df=338 and t-probability=0.000 while t-ratio=-4.011, df=338 and t-probability=0.000 for the religion. Lastly, the computed t- ratio=2.095, df=338, t-probability=.037 was determined by employment status, thus indicated that the type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, and employment status observed significant level which was lower than 0.05 alpha. The null hypothesis which states that there were no significant difference between the levels of awareness on GAD among SUC's when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, and employment status,

in terms of the key areas of GAD such as policy, people, enabling mechanism, and programs/activities/projects was rejected. On the other hand, as to the category and length of service, the t-test computation showed that there were no significant differences in the level of awareness between faculty and staff. The computed t-ratio=1.003, df=338, t-probability=0.316 was determined from the category while for length of service had a computed t-ratio=.295, df=338, t-probability=0.768 indicated that the observed significant level was more than 0.05 alpha.

Table 7. Difference on the Awareness on GAD when Classified According to Type of School, Population, Age, Sex, Religion, Category, Employment Status, and Length of Service

	N	Mean	T-Ratio	df	Two-tailed probability	Remarks
SUC Type						
College	124	3.5905	-8.903	338	0	Significant
University	216	4.172				
SUC Population						
Small (less than 5,00)	118	3.6018	-8.18	338	0	Significant
Big (5,000 and above	222	4.1503				
Age						
Young (36 yrs. old and below)	162	4.0604				
			2.775	338	0.006	Significant
Old (37 years old and above)	178	3.8685				
Sex						
Male	112	3.7646				
Female	228	4.0559	-4.011	338	0	Significant
Religion						
Catholic	277	4.0178	3.683	338	0	Significant
Non-Catholic	60	3.6852	0.69205			
Category						
Faculty	178	3.9933	1.003	338	0.316	Not Significant
Staff	162	3.9232				
Employment Status						
Casual	120	4.0584	2.095	338	0.037	Significant
Permanent	220	3.9062				
Length of Service						
Short (10 yrs. and below)	149	3.9482	0.295	338	0.768	Not Significant
Long (11 yrs. and above)	191	3.96				

p<0.05

Table 8 presents the differences in the level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, civil status, and educational attainment. Results showed that there were significant differences in level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when classified as to SUC level and civil status. As to SUC level, it had computed F-ratio=20.309, df=3, P- value=.000. As to civil status, the computed was F-ratio=19.301, df=3, P-value=.0 indicated that the observed significant level were lower than 0.05 alpha, thus, the null hypothesis which states that there were no significant difference in the level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to their educational attainment was rejected. However, there were no significant differences in level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when classified as to educational attainment. The computed F-ratio=.691, df=2, P-value=.558 indicated that the observed significant level was not lower than 0.05 alpha, thus, the null hypothesis which states that there were no significant difference in the level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to their educational attainment was accepted.

Table 8. Differences on the Awareness on GAD when Classified According to SUC Level, Civil Status, and Educational Attainment

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Ratio	p-Value	Remarks
SUC Level						
Between Groups	21.528	3	7.176	20.309	0	Significant
Within Groups	118.722	336	0.353			
Total	140.250	339				
Civil Status						
Between Groups	24.448	3	6.065	19.301	0	Significant
Within Groups	115.227	344	0.353			
Total	150.25	346				
Educational Attainment						
Between Groups	3.315	2	1.658	0.691	0.558	Not Significant
Within Groups	136.935	337	0.406			
Total	140.25	339				

p<0.05

Table 9 presents the differences in the level practices on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, category, employment status, and length of service. Results showed that there were significant differences in the level of practices on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, and religion. As to type of school, it had the computed t-ratio=-8.316, df=338, t-probability=0.000, The computed t-ratio=-8.160, df=338, t-probability=0.00 was observed from the population profile. As to age, it showed a computed t-ratio= 2.74, df=338, t-probability=.006. The sex classification had computed t-ratio=-3.975, df=338, t-probability=0.00. As to religion, the computation showed that the t-ratio=2.91, df=335, t-probability=0.004, indicated that the observed significant level from the profile above was lower than 0.05 alpha. This meant that there were significant difference in levels of practices on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, and religion. On the other hand, there were no significant differences in the level of practices on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to category, employment status, and length of service. As to category, the t-test computation showed t- ratio=1.353, df=338, t-probability=0.177. As to employment status, the computed was t- ratio=1.704, df=388, t-probability=0.089. Lastly, as to length of service, computed t- ratio=-.226, df=388, t-probability=0.821, indicated that the significant level of category, employment status, and length of service were more than 0.05 alpha. This meant that there were no significant difference in levels of practices on GAD among SUCs classified as to category, employment status, and length of service.

Table 9. Difference on the Practices on GAD when Classified According to Type of School, Population, Age, Sex, Religion, Category, Employment Status, and Length of Service

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Ratio	df	P-Value	Remarks
SUC Type							
College	124	3.3732	0.901	-8.316	338	0	Significant
University	216	4.0312	0.5576				
Population							
Small (less than 5,00)	118	3.6635	0.921	-8.16	338	0	Significant
Big (5,000 and above)	222	4.0185	0.5569				
Age							
Young (36 yrs. old and below)	162	3.9101	0.6925	2.743	338	0.006	Significant
Old (37 yrs. old and above)	178	3.683	0.8208				
Sex							
Male	112	3.5595	0.74303	-3.975	338	0	Significant
Female	228	3.905	0.75845				
Religion							
Catholic	277	3.8482	0.7632	2.915	335	0.004	Significant
Non-Catholic	60	3.5309	0.7706				
Category							
Faculty	178	3.845	0.7771	1.353	338	0.177	Not Significant
Staff	162	3.7321	0.7595				
Employment Status							
Casual	120	3.8872	0.5389	1.704	388	0.089	Not Significant
Permanent	220	3.7388	0.8669				
Length of Service							
Short (10 yrs. and below)	149	3.7805	0.8022	-0.226	338	0.821	Not Significant
Long (11 yrs. and above)	191	3.7995	0.7454				

p<0.05

Table 10 presents the differences in the level of practices on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, civil status, and educational attainment. Results showed that there were significant differences in level of awareness on GAD among SUCs when classified as to SUC level and civil status. As to SUC level, it had computed F-ratio=21.258, df=3, P- value=.000. As to civil status, the computed was F-ratio=4.396, df=2, P-value=.013 indicated that the observed significant level were lower than 0.05 alpha. However, there were no significant differences in level of practices on GAD among SUCs when classified as to educational attainment. The computed F-ratio=.610, df=3, P-value=.609 indicated that the observed significant level was not lower than 0.05 alpha.

Table 10. Differences on the Practices on GAD when Classified According to SUC Level, Civil Status, and Educational Attainment

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Ratio	p-Value	Remarks
SUC Level						
Between Groups	32.037	3	7.176	21.258	.000	Significant
Within Groups	168.792	336	.353			
Total	200.829	339				
Civil Status						
Between Groups	5.107	2	2.553	4.396	.013	Significant
Within Groups	195.722	337	.581			
Total	200.829	339				
Educational Attainment						
Between Groups	1.088	3	.363	.610	.609	Not Significant
Within Groups	199.740	336	.594			
Total	200.829	339				

p<0.05

Table 11 presents the differences in the extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, category, employment status, and length of service. Results showed that there were significant differences in the extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, and employment status. As to SUC type, it computed t-ratio=-7.337, df=338, t- probability=0.000. A computed t-ratio=-7.337, df=338, t-probability=.000 was determined to the SUC population. As to age, it had computed t-ratio=2.44, df=338, t-probability=0.15. In terms of sex, it computed t-ratio=-3.315, df=338, t-probability=0.001 while t-ratio=3.013, df=335,t-probability=0.003 for the religion. Lastly, the computed t-ratio=2.374, df=338, t- probability=0.018 was determined by employment status, thus indicated that the type of SUC, population, age, sex, religion, and employment status observed significant level which was lower than 0.05 alpha. On the other hand, as to the category and length of service, the t-test computation showed that there were no significant differences in the extent of implementation between faculty and staff. The computed t-ratio=131, df=338, t-probability=.259 was determined from the category while for length of service had a computed of t-ratio=0.079, df=338, t-probability=0.937 indicated that the observed significant level was more than 0.05 alpha.

Table 11. Difference on the Implementation on GAD when Classified According to Type of School, Population, Age, Sex, Religion, Category, Employment Status, and Length of Service

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	T-Ratio	df	P-Value	Remarks
Type of School							
College	124	1.9345	0.4546	- 7.337	338	0	Significant
University	216	2.2783	0.3921				
Population							
Small (less than 5,00)	118	1.9318	0.4598	- 7.118	338	0	Significant
Big (5,000 and above)	222	2.2705	0.3935				
Age							
Young (36 yrs. old and below)	162	2.2147	0.4173	2.446	338	0.015	Significant
Old (37 yrs. old and above)	178	2.0968	0.4668				
Sex							
Male	112	2.04	0.388	- 3.315	338	0.001	Significant
Female	226	2.2085	0.4643				
Religion							
Catholic	277	2.1854	0.448	3.013	335	0.003	Significant
Non-Catholic	60	1.9953	0.4199				
Category							
Faculty	178	2.1791	0.4274	1.131	338	0.259	Not Significant
Staff	162	2.1242	0.4676				
Employment Status							
Casual	120	2.2304	0.3277	2.374	338	0.018	Significant
Permanent	220	2.1107	0.4961				
Length of Service							
Short (10 yrs. and below)	149	2.1551	0.4571	0.079	338	0.937	Not Significant
Long (11 yrs. and above)	191	2.1513	0.4405				

p<0.05

Table 12 presents the differences in the extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when grouped according to SUC level, civil status, and educational attainment. Results showed that there were significant differences in extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when classified as to SUC level and civil status. As to SUC level, it had computed F-ratio=16.090, df=3, P-value=.000. As to civil status, the computed was F-ratio=3.154, df=2, P-value=.044 indicated that the observed significant level were lower than 0.05 alpha. However, there were no significant differences in extent of implementation on GAD among SUCs when classified as to educational attainment. The computed F-ratio=.506, df=3, P-value=.678 indicated that the observed significant level was not lower than 0.05 alpha.

Table 12. Differences on the Extent of Implementation on GAD when Classified According to SUC Level, Civil Status, and Educational Attainment

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Ratio	p-Value	Remarks
SUC Level						
Between Groups	8.516	3	2.839	16.090	.000	Significant
Within Groups	59.276	336	.176			
Total	67.791	339				
Civil Status						
Between Groups	1.246	2	.623	3.154	.044	Significant
Within Groups	66.546	337	.197			
Total	67.791	339				
Educational Attainment						
Between Groups	.305	3	.102	.506	.678	Not Significant
Within Groups	67.486	336	.201			
Total	67.791	339				

p<0.05

Table 13 showed the relationship between level of awareness, practices, and implementation of GAD among SUC's in Region VI. A significant relationship was found among level of awareness, level of practices and extent of implementation of the respondents on GAD. A positive correlation among these variables was observed which means that as the level of awareness of the SUC on GAD is high, correspondingly the level of practice is high and the extent of implementation is likewise high.

Table 13. Relationships between the Levels of Awareness, Practices, and Implementation on GAD among SUCs

		Awareness on GAD	Practices on GAD	Implementation on GAD
Awareness on GAD	Pearson Correlation	1	.945	.870
	Siig.(2-tailed) N			
		340	.000	.000
			340	349
Practices on GAD	Pearson Correlation	.915	1	.844
	Siig.(2-tailed)			
	N	.000	340	.000
		340		340
Implementation on GAD	Pearson Correlation	.870	.844	1
	Siig.(2-tailed) N			
		.000	.000	340
		340	340	

CONCLUSION

Gender roles have an impact on organizational settings, and it becomes responsive to which aspects of human rights have been incorporated into such core education and governance. There is a sense of responsibility, composition, and structure, allowing it to function as a tool for advancing Gender and Development awareness, practices, and implementation. These gender-mainstreamed initiatives had documented successful programs that thrived to perform critical gender-related characteristics. Policies in key areas prioritize gender development, empowering them to constantly improve service delivery by identifying gaps in work areas and developing plans to achieve goals. As a result, government employees learnt more about gender issues and were more willing to discuss and accept GAD programs at school. The respondents' awareness of GAD Key areas concentrated on informing their teachers and staff so that it became a style and practice that was extremely relevant to their personal profile. The extent of implementation resulted in informing the faculty and staff in order to better the Gender and Development goals. As a

result, the distinctions in the profile and link between awareness, practices, and implementation indicated that when the SUC's awareness of GAD was high, so were the practices and level of implementation. Such programs, activities, and initiatives raised the awareness of faculty and staff in state colleges and universities, with an emphasis on the formation of GAD plans and budgets; and funds were provided to trainings, seminars, and workshops that equipped GAD implementers. Finally, the college's administration, or the Gender and Development Focal Point System (GFPS), guaranteed that men and women had equal opportunities to participate in Gender and Development Programs.

REFERENCES

Ampong, MF.M. (2017). DOLE-HRDS and CSC Conduct GAD Capacity-Building Seminars to BLR Staff. https://blr.dole.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/GAD-Activities.pdf

Asian Development Bank (2017). Asian Development Bank Support for Gender and Development (2005–2015). https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/evaluation-document/181135/files/tes-gender-and-development.pdf

Aspiras, E. D., Valerio , L. C. & Aspiras, L. S.. (2017). Constraints and Opportunities in Engendering Instruction. QSU Research Journal, 6(1). Retrieved from http://ejournals.ph/form/cite.php?id=15854

Castillo, L.M. (2017). GAD Audit @8 2017 GAD Budget Forum. https://www.coa.gov.ph/gad/resources/downloads/forum/GAD_Audit_at_8_2017_GA D_Budget_Forum.pdf

David, C.C., Albert, JR.G., and Vizmanos, JF. V. (2017). Sustainable Development Goal 5: How Does the Philippines Fare on Gender Equality? https://pidswebs.pids.gov.ph/CDN/PUBLICATIONS/pidsdps1745.pdf

Department of Energy (2016). DOE GENDER TOOLKIT for the Energy Sector. https://www.doe.gov.ph/sites/default/files/pdf/doe_gad/doe_gad_toolkit.pdf?withshi eld=1

Fritscher, L. (2017). The Glass Ceiling Effect And Its Impact On Women. https://www.everydayhealth.com/womens-health/glass-ceiling-effect-its-impact-on- women/

Galilea Center for Educational Development (2011). Gender Sensitivity Training June 1-2, 2011. http://jagna.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Gender-Sensitivity-Training- 2nd-Batch.pdf

Gavino-Gumba, B.M. (2013). Gender Equality in a Higher Educational Institution: A Case in the Philippines. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Gender-Equality-in-a-Higher- Educational-A-Case-in-Gavino Gumba/cdbec1356aa54b1dea372436e1ca7d0a81db312d#paper-header

Hega, M.D., Alporha, V.C., and Evangelista, M.S. (2017). Feminism and the Women's Movement in the Philippines: Struggles, Advances, and Challenges. https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/philippinen/14072.pdf

Llego, M.A. (2017). Updated DepEd Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy. https://www.teacherph.com/gender-responsive-policy/

MacPhail, P. (2015). Is Gender Inequality Really so low in the Philippines? https://www.eastasiaforum.org/2015/03/21/is-gender-inequality-really-so-low-in-the- philippines/

Philippine Commission on Women (2017). Memorandum Circular No. 2011-01: Guidelines for the creation, Strengthening, and Institutionalization of the GAD Focal Point System. https://pcw.gov.ph/memorandum-circular-no-2011-01-guidelines-for-the-creation-strengthening-and-institutionalization-of-the-gad-focal-point-system/

Sumadsad, C.R. and Tuazon, A.P. (2016). Gender and Development (GAD) Awareness in a Higher Education Institution. International Journal of Educational Science and Research (IJESR) 6(3), 75-86 ISSN(P): 2249-6947; ISSN(E): 2249-8052

Velasco, C. B. & Alicar-cadorna, E. (2014). Gender-responsive Capacity of Selected Local Government Units in Ilocos Sur, Philippines. IAMURE International Journal of Social Sciences, 10(1). Retrieved from http://ejournals.ph/form/cite.php?id=2333