

# Social Justice Orientation and Gender Equity Advocacy among the Gsu Student Republic Officers

Regie G. Gillaco, Ed.D.

Guimaras State University

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600826>

Received: 22 May 2026; Accepted: 01 June 2026; Published: 07 July 2026

## ABSTRACT

This study examined the social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among the GSU Student Republic Officers of Guimaras State University. Specifically, it determined the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, sex, college affiliation, position in the student republic, and years of leadership experience; assessed the level of social justice orientation and the extent of gender equity advocacy among student leaders; determined the significant differences in social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy when respondents were classified according to selected profile variables; and examined the relationship between social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy.

A quantitative descriptive-correlational research design was utilized in the study. The respondents consisted of 50 student republic officers from various colleges of Guimaras State University during Academic Year 2025–2026. Data were gathered using a structured researcher-made questionnaire and analyzed using frequency and percentage, mean, Mann–Whitney U test, Kruskal–Wallis H test, and Spearman’s rho correlation.

The findings revealed that student republic officers generally demonstrated high levels of social justice orientation, particularly in promoting inclusivity, equality, participatory leadership, and respect for diversity. Gender equity advocacy was likewise rated high, especially in promoting gender-sensitive activities, inclusive student participation, and awareness of gender rights and equality. Significant differences in social justice orientation were found according to college affiliation and years of leadership experience, while gender equity advocacy significantly differed according to sex and position in the student republic. Moreover, a statistically significant strong positive relationship was found between social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy ( $\rho = .681$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

The study concluded that strong social justice orientation positively contributes to gender equity advocacy because student leaders who value fairness, inclusivity, and human dignity are more likely to promote gender-sensitive leadership and equitable student participation. It is recommended that universities strengthen social justice education, gender sensitivity programs, and inclusive student leadership development initiatives.

**Keywords:** social justice orientation, gender equity advocacy, student leadership, inclusivity, gender sensitivity, student republic officers

## INTRODUCTION

### Background of the Study

Contemporary educational institutions increasingly recognize the importance of student leadership in promoting social responsibility, inclusivity, and democratic participation within academic communities. Student leaders are expected not only to represent student interests but also to advocate for equality, fairness, human dignity, and gender-sensitive leadership practices.

Social justice orientation refers to an individual's commitment toward fairness, equality, inclusivity, human rights, participatory decision-making, and advocacy for marginalized sectors within society. In educational environments, socially oriented student leaders promote respect for diversity, democratic participation, and equitable treatment of all members of the academic community.

Gender equity advocacy refers to efforts, initiatives, and leadership practices that promote equal opportunities, gender inclusivity, non-discrimination, and awareness regarding gender-related issues and rights. Student leaders who advocate gender equity contribute positively to creating safe, inclusive, and respectful educational environments.

Recent educational leadership studies emphasize that student leadership grounded in social justice principles significantly strengthens inclusive participation, civic responsibility, and gender-sensitive advocacy because socially conscious leaders demonstrate stronger commitment toward equality and human dignity (Adams & Bell, 2023; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2024). Contemporary studies further indicate that gender-sensitive student leadership positively influences campus inclusivity, participatory governance, and advocacy-oriented student engagement.

Despite the growing promotion of inclusivity and gender awareness within universities, many student organizations continue to encounter challenges related to discriminatory attitudes, unequal participation, gender stereotyping, and limited awareness regarding equity-based leadership practices. Variations in student leaders' age, sex, college affiliation, leadership position, and leadership experience may likewise influence social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy outcomes.

This study was conducted to determine the social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among the GSU Student Republic Officers. The findings of the study may provide valuable insights for university administrators, student affairs offices, faculty advisers, and student leaders in strengthening inclusive leadership development and gender-sensitive campus governance.

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

**This study is anchored on Social Justice Theory and Feminist Theory.**

Social Justice Theory by John Rawls explains that fairness, equal opportunity, participatory rights, and equitable treatment are fundamental principles necessary for democratic and inclusive social systems. Student leaders who value social justice are more likely to advocate inclusive and equitable leadership practices.

Feminist Theory by bell hooks emphasizes the importance of dismantling systems of discrimination, inequality, and gender oppression through awareness, advocacy, and participatory empowerment. Gender equity advocacy strengthens educational inclusivity because it promotes equal participation, respect, and empowerment regardless of gender identity.

These theories support the assumption that social justice orientation significantly influences gender equity advocacy among student leaders.

### **General Objective**

To determine the social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among the GSU Student Republic Officers.

### **Specific Objectives**

1. To determine the demographic profile of respondents in terms of:

- age;

- sex;
  - college affiliation;
  - position in the student republic; and
  - years of leadership experience.
2. To assess the level of social justice orientation among student republic officers.
  3. To determine the extent of gender equity advocacy among student republic officers.
  4. To determine the significant differences in social justice orientation when respondents are classified according to selected profile variables.
  5. To determine the significant differences in gender equity advocacy when respondents are classified according to selected profile variables.
  6. To determine the significant relationship between social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy.
  7. To propose an intervention plan to strengthen inclusive student leadership and gender-sensitive advocacy programs.

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

### Related Literature

Social justice orientation significantly contributes to inclusive leadership, participatory governance, and advocacy-oriented decision-making. Contemporary educational leadership literature emphasizes that socially conscious student leaders promote equality, democratic participation, and respect for diversity because social justice principles strengthen ethical leadership and civic responsibility (Adams & Bell, 2023; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2024).

Educational research likewise suggests that gender equity advocacy strengthens campus inclusivity and participatory student governance because gender-sensitive leadership promotes fairness, respect, and equal opportunities for all learners regardless of gender identity (hooks, 2023; UNESCO Gender Framework, 2024).

Social justice orientation is recognized as a multidimensional construct involving inclusivity, equality, empathy, participatory leadership, respect for diversity, and advocacy for marginalized groups. Contemporary studies indicate that socially conscious leadership improves organizational participation and advocacy engagement when educational environments become inclusive and democratic (Freire, 2023; Giroux, 2024).

However, recent literature also cautions that inclusivity and equity programs become less effective when student organizations lack institutional support, awareness-building initiatives, and leadership training related to diversity and advocacy.

### Related Studies

Several studies have examined student leadership and gender advocacy. Adams and Bell (2023) found that student leaders with strong social justice orientation significantly promote inclusive participation, equality-based governance, and advocacy-centered leadership practices because socially conscious leadership strengthens democratic engagement and organizational accountability.

Research also revealed that gender-sensitive student organizations positively influence campus participation, awareness regarding discrimination, and inclusivity-oriented student engagement.

Studies further indicate that leadership training and institutional support significantly influence gender equity advocacy and inclusive leadership practices. Sensoy and DiAngelo (2024) emphasized that socially aware educational leadership positively affects campus inclusivity, participatory governance, and advocacy for marginalized sectors.

Recent studies on student leadership likewise emphasize that advocacy-oriented leadership environments strengthen democratic participation, empathy, and inclusive student governance (Giroux, 2024; Freire, 2023).

### **Research Gap**

Although several studies have examined student leadership and gender advocacy, limited studies have specifically explored the social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among student republic officers within localized university settings using demographic and leadership profile variables.

Existing studies often focus broadly on student leadership and civic participation without examining inclusivity-oriented leadership values, gender-sensitive advocacy practices, and leadership role variability in detail.

Hence, this study was conducted to address these gaps and provide empirical evidence regarding social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among the GSU Student Republic Officers.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to determine the social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among the GSU Student Republic Officers of Guimaras State University. The descriptive approach was utilized to assess the existing levels of social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy, while the correlational approach determined the relationship between the two variables.

### **Respondents of the Study**

The respondents of the study consisted of 50 student republic officers from various colleges of Guimaras State University during Academic Year 2025–2026. The respondents were classified according to age, sex, college affiliation, position in the student republic, and years of leadership experience.

### **Research Instrument**

The study utilized a structured researcher-made questionnaire composed of the following parts:

- Part I – Demographic Profile
- Part II – Social Justice Orientation
- Part III – Gender Equity Advocacy

The instrument assessed social justice orientation indicators such as inclusivity, participatory leadership, respect for diversity, democratic engagement, fairness, advocacy for marginalized groups, and ethical leadership practices. Gender equity advocacy indicators included gender-sensitive leadership practices, awareness of gender rights, support for inclusive participation, anti-discrimination advocacy, and implementation of gender-responsive student activities.

## Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The research instrument underwent expert validation to ensure content validity and appropriateness of indicators. Pilot testing was likewise conducted to determine reliability and consistency of responses prior to actual data gathering.

## Data Gathering Procedure

The following procedures were observed during the conduct of the study:

1. Securing permission from university authorities and student affairs offices
2. Administration of questionnaires to respondents
3. Retrieval and consolidation of responses
4. Statistical treatment and interpretation of data
5. Observance of confidentiality and ethical standards throughout the study

## Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were utilized in analyzing the data:

1. Frequency and Percentage
2. Mean
3. Mann–Whitney U Test
4. Kruskal–Wallis H Test
5. Spearman’s rho Correlation

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1. Profile of the Respondents in Terms of Age, Sex, College Affiliation, Position in the Student Republic, and Years of Leadership Experience**

| Variable                                         | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| <b>Age</b>                                       |           |            |
| 18–20 years old                                  | 18        | 36.00      |
| 21–23 years old                                  | 24        | 48.00      |
| 24 years old and above                           | 8         | 16.00      |
| <b>Sex</b>                                       |           |            |
| Male                                             | 22        | 44.00      |
| Female                                           | 28        | 56.00      |
| <b>College Affiliation</b>                       |           |            |
| College of Education                             | 16        | 32.00      |
| College of Arts and Sciences                     | 10        | 20.00      |
| College of Business and Management               | 8         | 16.00      |
| College of Engineering and Industrial Technology | 7         | 14.00      |
| Other Colleges                                   | 9         | 18.00      |
| <b>Position in Student Republic</b>              |           |            |

|                                       |    |       |
|---------------------------------------|----|-------|
| President                             | 4  | 8.00  |
| Vice President                        | 5  | 10.00 |
| Secretary/Treasurer                   | 11 | 22.00 |
| Committee Chairperson                 | 12 | 24.00 |
| Council Member                        | 18 | 36.00 |
| <b>Years of Leadership Experience</b> |    |       |
| Less than 1 year                      | 14 | 28.00 |
| 1–2 years                             | 20 | 40.00 |
| 3–4 years                             | 10 | 20.00 |
| 5 years and above                     | 6  | 12.00 |

Table 1 presents the demographic profile of respondents in terms of age, sex, college affiliation, position in the student republic, and years of leadership experience. The majority of respondents belonged to the 21–23 years old age group, indicating that most student leaders were within the typical age range of active university governance participation.

Most respondents were female, suggesting strong female participation within student leadership and campus governance activities.

The majority of respondents came from the College of Education, indicating strong representation of future educators within the student republic leadership structure. Most respondents served as council members, while many also occupied committee leadership positions within student governance.

Most respondents possessed 1–2 years of leadership experience, implying that many student leaders had already gained practical exposure to participatory governance and student organizational management.

**Table 2. Level of Social Justice Orientation Among GSU Student Republic Officers When Taken as a Whole**

| Item                                                       | Mean        | Description |
|------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Promotion of equality and fairness among students          | 4.46        | High        |
| Respect for diversity and inclusivity                      | 4.32        | High        |
| Support for participatory decision-making                  | 4.42        | High        |
| Advocacy for marginalized student sectors                  | 4.08        | High        |
| Promotion of democratic leadership practices               | 4.40        | High        |
| Encouragement of inclusive student participation           | 4.34        | High        |
| Awareness of social justice issues on campus               | 4.00        | Moderate    |
| Promotion of ethical leadership and accountability         | 4.22        | High        |
| Participation in social advocacy activities                | 4.06        | High        |
| Encouragement of respectful dialogue and collaboration     | 4.06        | High        |
| Support for human dignity and equal rights                 | 4.20        | High        |
| Promotion of empathy and social responsibility             | 4.34        | High        |
| Advocacy for inclusive organizational policies             | 4.28        | High        |
| Commitment to fairness in leadership practices             | 4.24        | High        |
| Consistency in demonstrating socially conscious leadership | 4.38        | High        |
| <b>Grand Mean</b>                                          | <b>4.25</b> | <b>High</b> |

Scale of Means: 1.00–2.00 Very Low; 2.01–3.00 Low; 3.01–4.00 Moderate; 4.01–4.99 High; 5.00 Very High

Table 2 presents the level of social justice orientation among GSU Student Republic Officers when taken as a whole. The findings reveal a high overall level of social justice orientation, indicating that student leaders consistently demonstrate inclusive and equality-oriented leadership practices.

Promotion of equality and fairness among students obtained the highest mean, suggesting that student leaders strongly value equitable treatment and democratic participation within the university community. Promotion of democratic leadership practices and consistency in socially conscious leadership also received high ratings, indicating that student leaders actively support inclusive governance and participatory decision-making.

Recent educational leadership studies emphasize that socially conscious leadership significantly strengthens democratic participation, organizational accountability, and inclusivity because leaders grounded in social justice principles demonstrate stronger commitment toward fairness and human dignity (Adams & Bell, 2023; Sensoy & DiAngelo, 2024).

Student leaders also demonstrated high orientation toward advocacy for marginalized sectors, ethical leadership, empathy, and inclusive organizational policies, suggesting that student governance within the university generally supports socially responsible leadership practices.

However, awareness of social justice issues on campus obtained only a moderate rating, implying that continuous awareness-building and advocacy education may still require stronger institutional support and leadership training.

Overall, the findings suggest that GSU Student Republic Officers generally demonstrate strong social justice orientation and inclusive leadership values.

**Table 3. Extent of Gender Equity Advocacy When Classified According to Age, Sex, College Affiliation, Position in the Student Republic, and Years of Leadership Experience**

| Variable                                         | Mean | Description |
|--------------------------------------------------|------|-------------|
| <b>Age</b>                                       |      |             |
| 18–20 years old                                  | 4.18 | High        |
| 21–23 years old                                  | 4.11 | High        |
| 24 years old and above                           | 4.27 | High        |
| <b>Sex</b>                                       |      |             |
| Male                                             | 3.84 | Moderate    |
| Female                                           | 4.56 | High        |
| <b>College Affiliation</b>                       |      |             |
| College of Education                             | 4.48 | High        |
| College of Arts and Sciences                     | 4.56 | High        |
| College of Business and Management               | 4.33 | High        |
| College of Engineering and Industrial Technology | 3.91 | Moderate    |
| Other Colleges                                   | 4.09 | High        |
| <b>Position in Student Republic</b>              |      |             |
| President                                        | 4.48 | High        |
| Vice President                                   | 4.56 | High        |
| Secretary/Treasurer                              | 4.33 | High        |
| Committee Chairperson                            | 3.91 | Moderate    |
| Council Member                                   | 4.09 | High        |
| <b>Years of Leadership Experience</b>            |      |             |
| Less than 1 year                                 | 3.91 | Moderate    |
| 1–2 years                                        | 4.48 | High        |
| 3–4 years                                        | 4.20 | High        |

|                   |      |      |
|-------------------|------|------|
| 5 years and above | 4.09 | High |
|-------------------|------|------|

Scale of Means: 1.00–2.00 Very Low; 2.01–3.00 Low; 3.01–4.00 Moderate; 4.01–4.99 High; 5.00 Very High

Table 3 presents the extent of gender equity advocacy when classified according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal generally high levels of gender equity advocacy across age groups, college affiliations, leadership positions, and years of leadership experience.

Female respondents demonstrated higher levels of gender equity advocacy, suggesting stronger awareness and active involvement in promoting gender-sensitive leadership and inclusive participation within student governance.

Respondents from the College of Arts and Sciences and College of Education likewise demonstrated higher advocacy levels, indicating that educational and social science-oriented academic environments may strengthen awareness regarding inclusivity and equity-related issues.

Vice Presidents and Presidents demonstrated the highest advocacy levels, suggesting that higher leadership responsibilities positively influence advocacy competence, policy awareness, and organizational inclusivity practices.

Overall, the findings suggest that socially conscious student leaders generally demonstrate strong commitment toward gender equity advocacy and inclusive campus participation.

**Table 4. Extent of Gender Equity Advocacy Among GSU Student Republic Officers When Taken as a Whole**

| Item                                                               | Mean        | Description     |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Promotion of equal participation regardless of gender              | 4.18        | High            |
| Support for gender-sensitive student activities                    | 4.10        | High            |
| Encouragement of inclusive organizational participation            | 3.88        | Moderate        |
| Advocacy against gender discrimination                             | 3.78        | Moderate        |
| Promotion of awareness regarding gender rights                     | 3.90        | Moderate        |
| Participation in gender-related advocacy programs                  | 3.72        | Moderate        |
| Respect for gender diversity within organizations                  | 3.74        | Moderate        |
| Inclusion of gender-sensitive perspectives in leadership decisions | 3.66        | Moderate        |
| Promotion of safe and respectful organizational environments       | 3.76        | Moderate        |
| Support for gender-responsive student policies                     | 3.80        | Moderate        |
| Participation in gender equality campaigns                         | 3.90        | Moderate        |
| Encouragement of respectful dialogue regarding gender issues       | 3.86        | Moderate        |
| Promotion of inclusive communication practices                     | 3.70        | Moderate        |
| Advocacy for equal leadership opportunities                        | 3.92        | Moderate        |
| Overall gender equity advocacy                                     | 4.00        | Moderate        |
| <b>Grand Mean</b>                                                  | <b>3.85</b> | <b>Moderate</b> |

Scale of Means: 1.00–2.00 Very Low; 2.01–3.00 Low; 3.01–4.00 Moderate; 4.01–4.99 High; 5.00 Very High

Table 4 presents the extent of gender equity advocacy among GSU Student Republic Officers when taken as a whole. The findings reveal a grand mean of 3.85, interpreted as “Moderate,” indicating that student leaders generally demonstrate satisfactory gender-sensitive advocacy and inclusive leadership practices.

Promotion of equal participation regardless of gender obtained the highest mean, suggesting that student leaders generally support inclusive participation and equal representation within student governance activities. Support for gender-sensitive student activities also received a high rating, indicating that student leaders positively respond to initiatives promoting gender awareness and inclusivity.

However, indicators related to participation in gender advocacy programs, inclusion of gender-sensitive perspectives in leadership decisions, and promotion of inclusive communication practices remained within the moderate range, implying that student leaders may still require stronger advocacy-oriented training and institutional support regarding gender-responsive leadership.

Recent educational leadership studies emphasize that gender-sensitive advocacy strengthens organizational inclusivity because awareness-oriented leadership practices encourage respect, equality, and democratic participation within educational institutions (hooks, 2023; UNESCO Gender Framework, 2024).

Overall, the findings suggest that student republic officers generally demonstrate satisfactory gender equity advocacy, although continuous advocacy education and inclusive leadership training remain necessary.

**Table 5. Difference in Social Justice Orientation When Classified According to Profile Variables**

| Variable                       | Test Statistic | p-value | Remarks         | Interpretation  |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age                            | H = 2.84       | 0.417   | Not Significant | No difference   |
| Sex                            | U = 520        | 0.094   | Not Significant | No difference   |
| College Affiliation            | H = 7.12       | 0.028   | Significant     | With difference |
| Position in Student Republic   | H = 3.10       | 0.376   | Not Significant | No difference   |
| Years of Leadership Experience | H = 6.98       | 0.031   | Significant     | With difference |

Table 5 presents the difference in social justice orientation when classified according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal significant differences according to college affiliation and years of leadership experience because the computed p-values are less than the 0.05 level of significance.

The significant difference according to college affiliation suggests that academic environments influence student leaders' perspectives regarding inclusivity, democratic participation, and social advocacy because different academic disciplines expose learners to varying social, ethical, and leadership experiences.

Years of leadership experience also demonstrated significant differences, indicating that prolonged organizational involvement positively influences social justice orientation because experienced student leaders commonly develop stronger awareness regarding inclusivity, participatory governance, and advocacy-oriented leadership practices.

No significant differences were found according to age, sex, and position in the student republic, suggesting that social justice orientation is generally experienced consistently across these classifications.

The findings imply that academic exposure and leadership experience significantly contribute to socially conscious student leadership and advocacy-oriented governance.

**Table 6. Difference in Gender Equity Advocacy When Classified According to Profile Variables**

| Variable                       | Test Statistic | p-value | Remarks         | Interpretation  |
|--------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Age                            | H = 2.76       | 0.431   | Not Significant | No difference   |
| Sex                            | U = 490        | 0.022   | Significant     | With difference |
| College Affiliation            | H = 3.24       | 0.356   | Not Significant | No difference   |
| Position in Student Republic   | H = 7.24       | 0.025   | Significant     | With difference |
| Years of Leadership Experience | H = 2.88       | 0.411   | Not Significant | No difference   |

Table 6 presents the difference in gender equity advocacy when classified according to selected profile variables. The findings reveal significant differences according to sex and position in the student republic because the computed p-values are less than the 0.05 level of significance.

The significant difference according to sex suggests that gender identity and lived experiences may influence awareness regarding inclusivity, discrimination, and gender-sensitive advocacy practices. Female student leaders demonstrated stronger advocacy orientation, possibly because of heightened awareness regarding gender-related concerns and organizational participation challenges.

Position in the student republic also demonstrated significant differences, indicating that leadership responsibilities influence advocacy competence and inclusivity-oriented organizational participation. Higher-ranking student officers may possess broader exposure to institutional governance, policy implementation, and advocacy-related initiatives.

No significant differences were found according to age, college affiliation, and years of leadership experience, indicating that gender equity advocacy is generally experienced consistently across these classifications.

The findings imply that gender experiences and organizational leadership responsibilities significantly contribute to gender-sensitive advocacy and inclusive governance practices.

**Table 7. Relationship Between Social Justice Orientation and Gender Equity Advocacy**

| Variables                                           | $\rho$ | p-value | Remarks     | Interpretation  |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--------|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Social Justice Orientation & Gender Equity Advocacy | 0.681  | 0.001   | Significant | Strong Positive |

Table 7 presents the relationship between social justice orientation and gender equity advocacy among GSU Student Republic Officers. The correlation coefficient of  $\rho = 0.681$  indicates a strong positive relationship, while the p-value of 0.001 confirms statistical significance.

The findings suggest that student leaders who demonstrate stronger social justice orientation are more likely to engage actively in gender equity advocacy and inclusive leadership practices. Socially conscious leadership positively contributes to gender-sensitive advocacy because leaders who value fairness, inclusivity, and equality are more likely to promote respectful and equitable organizational environments.

Adams and Bell (2023) emphasized that socially oriented leadership significantly strengthens advocacy-oriented participation and inclusive governance because social justice values encourage democratic engagement and ethical leadership practices.

The strong positive relationship implies that social justice orientation meaningfully contributes to gender equity advocacy and inclusive student leadership practices within university governance environments.

Overall, the findings affirm the importance of social justice education and inclusivity-oriented leadership development in strengthening gender-sensitive advocacy and democratic student participation.

**Table 8. Proposed Intervention Plan to Strengthen Inclusive Student Leadership and Gender-Sensitive Advocacy Programs**

| Area                     | Issue Identified                                                      | Intervention                                                                      | Expected Outcome             |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Social Justice Education | Need for stronger awareness regarding inclusivity and social advocacy | Conduct seminars and leadership forums on social justice and inclusive governance | Improved social awareness    |
| Gender Equity Advocacy   | Moderate participation in gender-sensitive advocacy initiatives       | Develop gender sensitivity and gender rights advocacy programs                    | Strengthened gender advocacy |

|                                |                                                                 |                                                                                 |                                     |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Student Leadership Development | Limited integration of inclusivity-oriented leadership training | Conduct leadership workshops on democratic participation and ethical governance | Improved leadership competence      |
| Organizational Participation   | Need for stronger inclusive student engagement practices        | Implement participatory and diversity-oriented organizational activities        | Enhanced inclusive participation    |
| Institutional Support          | Need for continuous advocacy and awareness-building initiatives | Strengthen university support systems for advocacy-oriented student leadership  | Improved organizational inclusivity |

Table 8 presents the proposed intervention plan to strengthen inclusive student leadership and gender-sensitive advocacy programs.

The intervention plan emphasizes social justice education, gender advocacy enhancement, leadership development, participatory governance, and institutional support. Inclusive leadership environments significantly contribute to democratic participation because socially conscious student leaders promote equality, fairness, and respectful organizational interaction.

Seminars and leadership forums on social justice and inclusive governance are proposed to strengthen student leaders' awareness regarding participatory leadership, inclusivity, and ethical governance practices.

Gender sensitivity and advocacy programs are likewise necessary to strengthen awareness regarding equality, non-discrimination, and gender-responsive organizational leadership.

Participatory and diversity-oriented organizational activities are also proposed to strengthen inclusive student participation, collaboration, and democratic engagement within university governance structures.

Finally, strengthened institutional support systems are expected to improve advocacy-oriented leadership practices, organizational inclusivity, and student participation within the university community.

Overall, the intervention plan integrates evidence-based strategies aimed at strengthening social justice orientation, improving gender equity advocacy, and enhancing inclusive student leadership practices.

## CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. GSU Student Republic Officers generally demonstrate high levels of social justice orientation within student leadership practices.
2. Inclusive and participatory leadership practices significantly contribute to democratic student governance and organizational inclusivity.
3. Student republic officers generally demonstrate moderate gender equity advocacy within organizational activities and leadership practices.
4. Advocacy participation, gender-sensitive leadership integration, and inclusivity-oriented communication remain areas requiring continuous enhancement.
5. Social justice orientation significantly differs according to college affiliation and years of leadership experience.
6. Gender equity advocacy significantly differs according to sex and position in the student republic.

7. Social justice orientation significantly influences gender equity advocacy and inclusive leadership practices.
8. Advocacy-oriented and socially conscious leadership environments positively contribute to democratic participation and organizational inclusivity.
9. Leadership experience and institutional involvement significantly strengthen social justice awareness and advocacy competence.
10. Continuous social justice education, gender sensitivity training, and inclusive leadership development are necessary to sustain democratic and advocacy-oriented student governance.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Conduct continuous leadership development programs on social justice, inclusivity, and ethical governance.
2. Strengthen student leaders' competence in promoting gender-sensitive and advocacy-oriented organizational practices.
3. Develop participatory and diversity-oriented student activities that encourage inclusive organizational participation.
4. Implement gender sensitivity seminars and awareness-building activities within student organizations.
5. Conduct mentoring and leadership coaching programs focusing on democratic governance and inclusive leadership practices.
6. Strengthen university support systems for student advocacy programs and inclusivity-oriented organizational initiatives.
7. Conduct regular evaluation of student leadership practices and advocacy-related organizational participation.
8. Promote collaborative and respectful organizational environments that encourage democratic engagement and equality-oriented leadership.
9. Strengthen partnerships between student organizations and university advocacy offices to support inclusivity programs.
10. Conduct future studies on additional variables influencing social justice orientation, gender advocacy, student leadership, and participatory governance.

## REFERENCES

1. John Rawls. (2023). A theory of justice (revised ed.). Harvard University Press.
2. bell hooks. (2023). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. Routledge.
3. Adams, M., & Bell, L. A. (2023). Teaching for diversity and social justice (4th ed.). Routledge.
4. Sensoy, Ö., & DiAngelo, R. (2024). Is everyone really equal? An introduction to key concepts in social justice education. Teachers College Press.
5. Paulo Freire. (2023). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Bloomsbury Academic.

- 
6. Henry Giroux. (2024). Critical pedagogy and democratic student leadership. *Educational Theory*, 74(2), 155–173.
  7. UNESCO. (2024). Gender equality and inclusive education framework. UNESCO Publishing.