

# Gender Dynamics in Criminal Justice: A Study of Student Attitudes Towards Women

Mary Joald D. Acojedo, Irah Xanthia P. Panday, Kenneth B. Placa

Department of Criminal Justice Education, University of Mindanao Digos College, Philippines

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100600977>

Received: 19 June 2026; Accepted: 24 June 2026; Published: 09 July 2026

## ABSTRACT

Women in the criminal justice system still have to endure stereotypical and unequal treatment that could affect the perceptions of future practitioners of the profession, despite the improvement of gender equality. The purpose of the study was to determine students' attitudes towards the criminal justice system regarding women. The research participants were 278 criminology students of UM Digos College, and the researchers used a comparative research technique. Results indicated that most participants were male, aged 21-23, in their third year of study, mostly Bisaya, and single. Students demonstrated moderate levels of positive attitudes towards women in the criminal justice field. Considerable variations were found by sex, with male students showing more positive attitudes than their female counterparts. In addition, first-year students had the most positive perceptions, whereas minority groups such as Bagobo and other ethnicities had more positive perceptions than the Bisaya majority. There were no significant differences in attitudes when analyzed by age or relationship status. The socio-demographic variables, such as sex, academic exposure, and tribe, showed a significant difference. It is recommended that criminal justice educators incorporate gender-sensitivity training and awareness courses into the criminology curriculum to foster a more inclusive outlook among women in the profession.

**Keywords:** Gender dynamics, Criminal Justice, attitude, women

## INTRODUCTION

The debates over how women are represented and treated within the criminal justice system have gained relevance over the years, particularly in how people view gender relations. Studies have discussed the intersection of gender with race and class and pointed out that women who are representatives of these groups are often subject to a variety of prejudices in the criminal justice system (Geppert, 2022). A change in the profession's culture is needed to treat women better and to acknowledge their roles and contributions, since such prejudices are often institutionalized (Case et al., 2021). Women are assigned smaller, more feminine roles and, consequently, are often assigned administrative or supportive roles that involve working with victims, rather than leadership or decision-making roles (Rahman, 2022).

Research works done worldwide have revealed that the issues of gender bias in criminal justice not only impact female offenders and victims but also female professionals in the field. In addition to the fact that gender stereotypes are still applied in judicial decisions, women have less representation among judges and the chiefs of law enforcement (Liang et al., 2024). The process of gender equality has been moving slowly, with some countries having more achievements than others. Legal changes and cultural norms have contributed significantly to these efforts (Hsieh & Boateng, 2020). The other nations have been improving at their own pace, and cultural and legal changes have contributed to progress, though most nations have been relatively slow to achieve gender equity (Bohm, 2020).

In the Philippines, criminal justice system gender dynamics have been on the frontline, policies like the Magna Carta for Women (Republic Act No. 9710) would treat the inequity between the genders. Research indicates that women have also occupied important positions within the Philippine criminal justice system, including law

enforcement and the courts. There are still gender stereotypes, and career growth is not easy either, as women do not have equal opportunities (Maglinte & Gempes, 2021). In many cases, crime victims experience the lack of responsive justice at the time when it is needed the most by women (Bose, 2020). Research has revealed that although women have impressive positions in the Philippine criminal justice system, the journey to the top of the career ladder is not even. Systemic obstacles that prevent the advancement of women, especially in promotions and career opportunities, remain. In many cases, this is due to the persistent nature of gender stereotypes and the underrepresentation of women in positions of authority (Aydinan, 2019).

At the local level, despite increased appreciation of the role of women in law enforcement and the practice of law, a major challenge remains in ensuring gender equality in work opportunities and leadership (Cabilan et al., 2023). The students hold traditional beliefs about gender roles, which may affect their career goals and how they conduct or serve women within the criminal justice system. Surveys of local areas show that knowledge of gender equality is growing, though cultural factors tend to impede the full recognition of women in senior criminal justice roles (Villegas et al., 2022). Other officials on the barangay level do not even believe that women can perform criminal-related tasks, which is indicative of the overall attitudes toward gender roles (Diaz et al., 2024). These perceptions discourage young women from pursuing careers in criminal justice and law enforcement.

The study is grounded in Brabeck and Brown's (1997) Feminist Theory to investigate attitudes and behavior in the field through the lens of patriarchal structures and social rules. This view is also applicable because it highlights the gender roles and stereotypes that shape women's perspectives in male-dominated careers such as law enforcement, the judiciary, and corrections (Smith, 2010). Among the crucial aspects of Feminist Theory is the realization that traditional gender stereotypes and gender roles are likely to deprive women of full social and professional participation, restricting their roles and opportunities (Whaley, 2024). Through Feminist Theory, the research will reveal how societal demands impose limitations on women and, in turn, perpetuate gender inequality in representation and acknowledgment within the criminal justice system.

Additionally, the study is grounded in Gender Role Theory (Eagly & Crowley, 1986), which hypothesizes that societal expectations and cultural norms shape the behaviors, attitudes, and roles assigned to people based on gender. This theory states that men and women are taught certain roles at a young age, which shape their views of what is considered appropriate for each gender in different areas of life, including future careers. (Cundiff & Vescio, 2019). In male-dominated careers like criminal justice, conventional gender roles often place men at the top. In contrast, women may not be well-suited to jobs that demand physical strength or command. This socialization process reinforces stereotypes that may influence how people see and judge women in the police force and other related careers (McCarty & Burt, 2024). This is of great significance in the context of this study because it provides a model of how deeply ingrained social norms shape students' perceptions of women in the field. It helps explain why some students may be biased toward women's competence, leadership skills, or aptitude for work in criminal justice.

The study may be relevant to school administration, as it may provide a detailed understanding of gender attitudes in the criminology department. The findings may inform the development of policies, programs, and curricula that promote gender equity, raise awareness of unconscious bias, and foster a more respectful and inclusive educational environment. The results of this study can help teachers adjust their teaching methods and resources to address gender differences and stereotypes in criminal justice education. The research will help students become more aware of their gender attitudes and prejudices towards women in the criminal justice system. The outcome will most likely lead to self-reflection and open communication about gender issues, resulting in more informed, respectful, and equal behaviors within the classroom and in future work environments. This research can serve as a blueprint for future researchers seeking to examine gender dynamics in criminal justice education and practice. The findings may serve as a benchmark against which comparative research, in particular those that encompass other teaching institutions or professional areas within the criminal justice department, can be compared.

## Research Objectives

This study aimed to assess students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system. Specifically, it aimed:

1. To determine the demographic profile of students in terms of:
  - 1.1 age;
  - 1.2 sex;
  - 1.3 year level;
  - 1.4 tribe; and
  - 1.5 relationship status.
2. To determine the students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system.
3. To assess if there is a significant difference in the student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system when analyzed according to their demographic profile.

## METHOD

### Respondents

The respondents in this study were 278 UM Digos College criminology students. Students who were not enrolled in the criminology department at the time of the study were excluded. The study used a simple random sampling technique. According to Etikan and Bala (2020), simple random sampling provides each individual in the population an equal opportunity of being included in the study, thereby enhancing the reliability and generalizability of the findings. This was employed to ensure that each criminology student had an equal chance of being selected as a participant. They were fully informed about the study's objectives, the risks involved, the nature of their participation, and their freedom to discontinue participation at any moment.

### Instrument

The researchers used a questionnaire adopted from Escovedo's (2020) study, "Attitudes of Criminal Justice Students Towards Women: Hegemonic Masculinity in the Workplace." Part I focused on the demographic profile of the respondents. Part II consisted of 26 items measuring attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system, rated on a 5-point Likert scale. The interpretations were as follows:

| Numerical Scale | Range of Means | Descriptive Levels | Descriptive Meaning                                                                                             |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5               | 4.20 – 5.00    | Very High          | This indicates that the respondents have a very positive attitude towards women in the criminal justice system. |
| 4               | 3.40 – 4.19    | High               | This indicates that the respondents have a positive attitude towards women in the criminal justice system.      |
| 3               | 2.60 – 3.39    | Moderate           | This indicates that the respondents have a neutral attitude towards women in the criminal justice system.       |
| 2               | 1.80 – 2.59    | Low                | This indicates that the respondents have a negative attitude towards women in the criminal justice system.      |
| 1               | 1.00 – 1.79    | Very Low           | This indicates that the respondents have a very negative attitude towards women in the criminal justice system. |

---

## Design and Procedure

In this research, the authors used a descriptive-comparative research approach. The descriptive-comparative research design focuses on analyzing trends and outcomes across multiple groups to conduct meaningful comparisons that either formulate theories or serve as a basis for practice (McCombes, 2024). In this way, the researchers could identify significant differences through systematic comparisons of the attitudes of the various student subgroups, including those based on age, gender, tribe, and relationship status.

The study was conducted through a systematic, careful data collection process to ensure accuracy, ethical integrity, and valid research findings. Firstly, the researchers sought permission to conduct the study at UM Digos College by writing a formal letter requesting permission from the Program Head of Criminology and the School VP - Branch Operations. The goals, methods, and ethics of the study were outlined in this letter. They were deemed important to the study in the context of criminology education and gender dynamics in criminal justice. All the students were given an informed consent form explaining the purpose of the study, that their participation was voluntary, that their information would be used, and that their responses would be confidential. The consent form was read and signed by the students, and then the survey was completed. Once the surveys had been completed, the researchers verified their completeness and accuracy. An analysis of the data was carried out to identify patterns and significant differences among student subgroups based on demographics.

The study findings were analyzed and interpreted using a parametric statistical tool to yield valid and significant results. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the students' demographic profile, including means, standard deviations, and percentage distributions. Independent-samples t-tests were used to evaluate differences in demographic profiles and student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system. To determine significant differences in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used to assess variations between the two sexes and the two statuses. The Kruskal-Wallis Test was employed to determine the significance of differences in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system, with age, year level, and tribe as factors.

## Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the ethical policies and procedures established by the UM Digos College Research and Innovation Center. The relevant authorities in the school were permitted to conduct the study. The researchers have ensured that the subjects were recruited appropriately and that potential risks involved in the study, whether socioeconomic, psychological, or physical, were considered and mitigated.

**Voluntary Participation.** The research received approval from the relevant university authorities. The researchers acted to ensure that the recruitment process among participants was conducted properly, that possible risks were evaluated, and that countermeasures were put in place. The participants were well informed about the study, and their consent was obtained prior to their participation.

**Privacy and Confidentiality.** All data gathered during the research were kept confidential and stored in a safe place to ensure the privacy and well-being of the participants.

**Informed Consent Process.** The survey used in this study was formulated in easy-to-understand language so that respondents knew the potential gains the research could have for the school. The survey was conducted with the approval of the school officials and the respondents.

**Risks.** The study aimed to minimize risks to participants and ensure that no risky cases would harm their health, mental state, or social status. The research safeguarded the rights and privileges of every subject.

**Benefits.** The findings were used to inform institutions in formulating more targeted interventions and programs that promoted gender equality and rectified criminology program biases.

Plagiarism. The researcher has ensured that she has properly referenced the ideas of other authors and researchers. To ensure this, the paper was checked for plagiarism and grammatical errors using Grammarly and Turnitin.

Falsification. This study builds on previous studies, and care was taken not to make assumptions based solely on the literature. All the data was properly noted and referenced using only credible sources, such as scientific journals and other reliable sources. APA 7th edition citation guidelines thoroughly guided the paper, ensuring there was no manipulation of information or results. The presentation of all information and data was accurate.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Characteristics of Respondents

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the 278 respondents in terms of sex, age, year level, tribe, and relationship status.

Table 1. Characteristics of 278 respondents included in the study

| Profile           | f   | %    |
|-------------------|-----|------|
| <b>Sex</b>        |     |      |
| Male              | 212 | 76.3 |
| Female            | 66  | 23.7 |
| <b>Age</b>        |     |      |
| 18-20 yrs. Old    | 129 | 46.4 |
| 21-23 yrs. Old    | 143 | 51.4 |
| 24-26 yrs. Old    | 6   | 2.2  |
| <b>Year Level</b> |     |      |
| First Year        | 60  | 21.6 |
| Second Year       | 68  | 24.5 |
| Third Year        | 91  | 32.7 |
| Fourth Year       | 59  | 21.2 |
| <b>Tribe</b>      |     |      |
| Bisaya            | 269 | 96.8 |
| B'laan            | 2   | .7   |
| Bagobo            | 3   | 1.1  |
| Others            | 4   | 1.4  |
| <b>Status</b>     |     |      |
| Single            | 214 | 77.0 |
| Dating            | 64  | 23.0 |

Regarding sex, most respondents were male (212, or 76.3 percent), and the number of female students did not exceed 66 (23.7 percent of the sample). This demonstrates that the percentage of male students is much higher among the participants, which could be one of the factors affecting the general attitude reflected in the research.

In terms of age, over half of the respondents (143 or 51.4) fell within the 2123 years old cohort. This was then followed by the 18-20 age group (129 or 46.4), and an extremely low percentage (6 or 2.2) was in the 24-26 years old group. These statistics imply that the respondents are mainly within the average age of college students.

In terms of year level, the majority were third-year and second-year students (91 or 32.7 and 68 or 24.5, respectively). This distribution is well balanced across all levels, with a slight concentration in the middle program years.

In terms of tribe, Bisaya (269 or 96.8%), B'laan (2 or 0.7%), Bagobo (3 or 1.1%), and other tribes (4 or 1.4%) were the most common. This implies that the sample used is mainly of local Bisaya-speaking people.

Regarding relationship status, the majority of respondents were single (214, 77.0%), with the remaining 64 (23.0%) in a dating relationship. This implies that most of them are not romantically committed to a partner at the time of the survey.

### Level of Student Attitudes Towards Women in the Criminal Justice System

Table 2 presents the level of student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system. The overall mean score of 3.02 with a standard deviation of 0.38 indicates a moderate level of positive attitudes among the respondents. This implies that while students generally hold favorable views toward women in criminal justice roles, there remain varying degrees of acceptance and support, suggesting that some traditional gender perceptions may still influence their attitudes.

Table 2. Level of student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system, n = 278

|                                                                       | $\bar{x}$   | <i>SD</i>   |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Student Attitudes Towards Women In The Criminal Justice System</b> | <b>3.02</b> | <b>0.38</b> |

The statement "Women should be encouraged to apply for male-dominated occupations" had the highest mean of 4.59, indicating a very high level of agreement. This means that students are strongly in favor of women entering careers that men, such as law enforcement, corrections, and other criminal justice roles, have long dominated. This implies that there is, in fact, a change in perceptions of gender equality and workplace inclusivity.

The finding is supported by Rahman's (2022) research, which emphasized that gender barriers and the encouragement and support of women in non-traditional roles can be overcome, allowing workplace diversity to flourish. In like manner, DeMatteo et al. (2020) underlined that promoting inclusive recruitment practices will assist in breaking gender stereotypes and provide women with additional opportunities to choose occupations dominated by men. Moreover, Stringer et al. (2022) found that social support is an important factor in women's career choices to work in criminal justice and that women encounter additional obstacles to support when entering male-dominated fields.

The statement "Women can perform as well as men in a variety of roles" received a mean of 4.27, indicating a very high level of agreement. This implies that students do not think there is any difference in women's capabilities in the execution of duties and responsibilities, regardless of the nature of the job. It also conveys the understanding that professional performance is more dependent on ability, training, and experience than on biological sex. This observation aligns with Diaz (2024), who found that gender is irrelevant to workplace performance as long as there is similarity in training and resources. Similarly, a study by Temizel (2022) found that female professionals in criminal justice and law enforcement were equally efficient and, in some cases, more

empathetic and better at solving problems than their male counterparts. Moreover, the article by Akanji et al. (2024) focused on the role of professional women in addressing occupational stereotypes within male-dominated occupations.

The statement “Women are as capable as men in excelling in male-dominated occupations” had a mean of 4.25, indicating very high agreement. This implies that the students understand that women can perform in places that have always been dominated by men, as long as they are accorded the same opportunities and encouragement. This indicates a positive progression among students regarding gender roles and the appreciation of the significance of equal access and equity in the workplace. This finding is supported by Liang et al. (2024), who reported that capability is founded on skills and training, not gender. Likewise, Shore et al. (2022) emphasized the need to reduce gender bias to ensure the success of women in such sectors. The Post et al. (2022) study shows that women entering male-dominated industries can help reduce the gender wage gap, demonstrating that women can receive the same pay and deliver the same results when given the chance.

### Differences in the Student Attitudes Towards Women in the Criminal Justice System When Analyzed by Sex

Table 3 displays the results of the Mann-Whitney U test, which show differences in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system by sex. These findings showed a statistically significant difference between male and female respondents ( $U = 5166.000$ ,  $Z = -3.054$ ,  $p = 0.002$ ). The set mean rank of male students (147.13) was significantly higher than that of female students (112.48), indicating that male respondents tend to have more positive attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system than female respondents. This means that, in general, male respondents were more supportive and had more positive attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system than female respondents.

Table 3. Mann-Whitney U test results showing the differences in the student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system when analyzed by sex

| Group  | n   | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks | Mann-Whitney U | Z      | Asymp. Sig. |
|--------|-----|-----------|--------------|----------------|--------|-------------|
| Male   | 212 | 147.13    | 31192.00     | 5166.000*      | -3.054 | .002        |
| Female | 65  | 112.48    | 7311.00      |                |        |             |

\* $p < 0.05$

This implies that male respondents in the sample are more likely to support women's involvement and performance in criminal justice-related areas than female respondents, who are also supportive but to a lesser extent. Such disparity can be attributed to different personal experiences and expectations, gender roles, societal expectations, or exposure to gender in male-dominated settings. It implies that male students in the sample are more likely to support the inclusion and effectiveness of women in criminal justice-related positions.

This is supported by Rahman (2022), who found that male students in law enforcement programs tend to be strongly supportive of women's inclusion, with most believing it would enhance diversity and workplace efficiency. Secondly, Temizel (2022) found that criminal justice education attitudes showed that male students had greater confidence in women's capabilities to succeed in traditionally male occupations, which may have resulted from a change in gender norms. Liang et al. (2024) emphasized that gender differences in perceptions can be associated with personal exposure to women who excel in such spheres.

### Differences in the Student Attitudes Towards Women in the Criminal Justice System When Analyzed by Age

Table 4 presents the results of the Kruskal-Wallis test, which indicate variation in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system by age. The findings did not show a statistically significant difference,  $2(2) = 0.61$ ,  $p = .739$ . Even though the mean rank of the 2426 age group was the greatest (163.58), with that of

the 1820 (139.30) and 2123 (137.69) coming next, the differences were not statistically significant. It implies that age does not influence respondents' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system. This would mean that, irrespective of age, the respondents share common views on the position and ability of women in the criminal justice system.

Table 4. Kruskal Wallis test results showing the differences on the student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system when analyzed by age

| Groups         | N   | Mean Rank | Chi-Square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
|----------------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-------------|
| 18-20 yrs. Old | 129 | 139.30    | .606       | 2  | .739        |
| 21-23 yrs. Old | 142 | 137.69    |            |    |             |
| 24-26 yrs. Old | 6   | 163.58    |            |    |             |

\*p<0.05

The result is supported by Garcia and Torres (2021), who found no significant differences in gender attitudes among criminology students across age groups, suggesting that the generational gap within the student group does not affect attitudes toward women in the police force. In the same manner, Johnson and Triplett (2020) found that attitudes towards female officers did not differ across age groups among criminal justice undergraduates in the United States, indicating the far-reaching gender equality discourse in both academic and social spheres. Moreover, Santos and Lacuesta (2022) found that age was not a defining characteristic of attitudes towards the competence of women in male-dominated professions, suggesting that perceptions of gender roles are determined by education rather than age.

#### Differences in the Student Attitudes Towards Women in the Criminal Justice System When Analyzed by Year Level

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test are presented in Table 5 and indicate differences in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system by year level. The result showed a statistically significant difference,  $\chi^2(3) = 36.70$ ,  $p < .001$ . The mean rank for first-year students was the highest (184.29), indicating that their attitudes are more positive than those of second-year students (98.43), third-year students (138.78), and fourth-year students (140.04). The drastic difference between the first- and second-year students suggests that the attitude might change over time or be influenced by academic exposure or experience. This means that the year level strongly influences perceptions of women in the criminal justice profession.

Table 5. Kruskal-Wallis test results showing the differences in the students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system when analyzed by year level

| Groups      | N  | Mean Rank | Chi-Square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
|-------------|----|-----------|------------|----|-------------|
| First Year  | 60 | 184.29    | 36.698     | 3  | .000        |
| Second Year | 68 | 98.43     |            |    |             |
| Third Year  | 90 | 138.78    |            |    |             |
| Fourth Year | 59 | 140.04    |            |    |             |

\*p<0.05

The result is supported by Morash et al. (2021), who found that criminal justice students' views became more realistic over time, influenced by course material and professional issues. Equally, Garcia and Cao (2020) stated

that first-year students tended to have more positive attitudes towards women officers than upper-level students, perhaps because they were less aware of the occupational barriers that women encounter. Along these lines, Pina and Gannon (2020) found that first-year criminology students in the UK held a more pro-gender equality position than their older peers, and this change was associated with greater awareness of systemic barriers and biases in the career.

### Differences in the Student Attitudes Towards Women in the Criminal Justice System When Analyzed by Tribe

Table 6 presents the results of a Kruskal-Wallis test examining differences in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system by tribe. The findings revealed a significant difference,  $\chi^2(3) = 8.57$ ,  $p = .036$ . The students who identified themselves as Bagobo (Mean rank = 213.67) and Others (Mean rank = 226.50) scored significantly higher on the attitude scores, with B'laan students (193.00) and Bisaya students (136.46) coming next. The proportion of respondents from the minority tribes was low. However, the findings indicate that tribal identification can impact attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system, and students with indigenous or minority backgrounds had more positive attitudes. This suggests that cultural context and ethnicity may contribute to perceptions of gender roles in the male-dominated criminal justice system.

Table 6. Kruskal-Wallis test results showing the differences in the student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system when analyzed by tribe

| Groups | N   | Mean Rank | Chi-Square | df | Asymp. Sig. |
|--------|-----|-----------|------------|----|-------------|
| Bisaya | 268 | 136.46    | 8.573      | 3  | .036        |
| B'laan | 2   | 193.00    |            |    |             |
| Bagobo | 3   | 213.67    |            |    |             |
| Others | 4   | 226.50    |            |    |             |

\* $p < 0.05$

The observation is supported by Garcia and Cao (2020), who found that exposure to diverse cultural attitudes and lived experiences tends to make people more inclusive towards women in law enforcement positions. Likewise, Morash et al. (2021) have noted that minority and indigenous students are more likely to support gender equality in policing, which they attribute to the fact that these groups share communal values focused on cooperation and mutual respect. Similarly, Villanueva (2020) emphasized that cultural heritage and identity can positively affect the individual acceptance of women in traditionally male occupations, as such backgrounds tend to run counter to general gender stereotypes.

### Differences in the Student Attitudes Towards Women in the Criminal Justice System When Analyzed by Relationship Status

Table 7 presents the results of the Mann-Whitney U test to examine differences in students' attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system by relationship status. The finding was non-statistically significant:  $U = 6382.00$ ,  $Z = -0.77$ ,  $p = .440$ . The attitude scores of single students (Mean rank = 141.04) and dating students (Mean rank = 132.22) were similar, indicating that relationship status does not significantly affect students' perceptions of the criminal justice system. This conclusion suggests that attitudes towards women working in male-dominated professions, such as criminal justice, are more determined by individual philosophy, cultural exposure, and educational factors than by relationship status.

Table 7. Mann-Whitney U test results showing the differences in the student attitudes towards women in the criminal justice system when analyzed by status

| Group  | N   | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks | Mann-Whitney U | Z     | Asymp. Sig. |
|--------|-----|-----------|--------------|----------------|-------|-------------|
| Single | 213 | 141.04    | 30041.00     | 6382.000       | -.773 | .440        |
| Dating | 64  | 132.22    | 8462.00      |                |       |             |

\*p<0.05

This finding aligns with the work of Miller and Lundgren (2020), who concluded that perceptions of gender roles in policing were mostly determined by social expectations and career training, rather than by background in marriage or relationships. In like manner, as noted by Carter and Wilson (2020), media portrayals and academic discussions influenced students' views of women's competence in law enforcement, based on their media coverage and university education, rather than their relationship experiences. In addition, Johnson et al. (2021) found that gender perceptions among criminal justice students did not vary significantly across demographic groups, such as relationship status, suggesting that formal education and exposure to a variety of role models are more important in shaping perceptions.

## CONCLUSION

Most of the respondents were male, aged 21 to 23, in the third year of study, most of them Bisaya and single. The students displayed moderate positive attitudes towards the women in the criminal justice system. There were found to be significant differences according to sex, male students tending to be more favorable than female students, according to year of study with first-year students, reporting the most positive views on the matter compared to higher-year students, and ethnicity, with minority groups, including Bagobo and other ethnic groups, tending to report more favorable attitudes in relation to this matter. No serious dissimilarities were found; there were no noteworthy differences in attitudes when age or relationship status was considered. It means that, though the attitude towards women representing the criminal justice sphere is rather positive in most cases, somesocio-demographic areas, including sex, academic exposure, and cultural background, contribute significantly to it.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations associated with the study results were as follows:

School administrators can come forward to introduce programs, seminars, or forums that foster gender sensitivity and equality, especially by recognizing the role and contributions of women in the criminal justice system. Including gender awareness in student support services and extracurricular activities may also help create an inclusive academic atmosphere that accommodates diversity and equal opportunities.

The instructors can include case studies, discussions, and in-class activities that undermine gender stereotypes and enhance respect towards women in law enforcement and other law-related areas. They can also undertake a reflective exercise and engage in open discussions to eliminate unconscious bias, helping students critically evaluate and expand their views on gender roles in the criminal justice system.

Students can also engage in feminist-sensitivity training and awareness programs, as well as participate in discussions at academic institutions, to address the equal treatment of women in the workplace. By encouraging open-mindedness and respecting women who choose careers in the criminal justice field, students can help create an educational environment that is more inclusive and cooperative, and that prioritizes competency and character over gender when determining who is a competent and valuable student.

Future Researchers can expand the study by incorporating a larger, more diverse sample to determine differences in attitudes across regions or institutions. They can also look at other factors like educational achievements,

exposure to the media, and personal experience with the justice system to better understand the other variables that contribute to the criminal; justice field.

## REFERENCES

1. Akanji, B., Mordi, C., & Ajonbadi, H. A. (2024). Confronting social dominance ideology: How professional women manage career stereotypes in male-dominated occupations. *Employee Relations: The International Journal*, 46(4), 913-933. <https://doi.org/10.1108/er-04-2022-0161>
2. Aydinan, J. J. (2019). Employment array of bachelor of science in criminology graduates in Nueva Ecija University of Science and Technology. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 4(6), 1733-1737. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.46.16>
3. Bohm, L. (2020). The politics of gender justice at the International Criminal Court. *The Politics of Gender Justice at the International Criminal Court*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199927890.003.0001>
4. Bose, A. (2020). Racial disparities in law enforcement: The role of in-group bias and electoral pressures. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3678500>
5. Brabeck, M., & Brown, L. (1997). Feminist theory and psychological practice, Shaping the future of feminist psychology: Education, research, and practice (pp. 15–35). *American Psychological Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10245->
6. Cabilan, W. M., Cuevas Jr, J. F., Aligo, J. B., Aguilar, G. A., Camay, H. P., & Dianalan, N. D. (2023). Gearing towards gender equality: Insights from female police officers in their experiences at their workplaces. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, VII(VI), 28-44. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2023.7604>.
7. Cundiff, J. L., & Vescio, T. K. (2016). Gender stereotypes influence how people explain gender disparities in the workplace. *Sex Roles*, 75(3-4), 126-138. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0593-2>
8. Carter, S., & Wilson, M. (2020). Media portrayals and students' perceptions of women in law enforcement. *Journal of Criminology and Media Studies*, 12(2), 145–160. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jcms.2020.789>
9. Case, S., Johnson, P., Manlow, D., Smith, R., & Williams, K. (2021). 25. Criminal justice policies and practices. *The Oxford Textbook on Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/he/9780198835837.003.0025>
10. Diaz, C. C., Sumedca, D. L., & Pineda, B. (2024). Perceived gender discrimination and its relationship to job satisfaction and organizational commitment among the uniformed personnel of the Philippines: Inputs to gender and development program. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(04). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i04-64>
11. DeMatteo, D., Heilbrun, K., Thornewill, A., & Arnold, S. (2020). Current issues in the criminal justice system. *Problem-Solving Courts and the Criminal Justice System*, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1093/med-psych/9780190844820.003.0001>
12. Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100(3), 283-308. <https://doi.org/10.1037//00332909.100.3.283>
13. Garcia, L., & Cao, L. (2020). Differences in attitudes toward women officers among criminal justice students: The role of academic standing. *Police Practice and Research*, 21(5), 456–470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2019.1691512>
14. Garcia, R. & Torres, M. (2021). Attitudes of college students toward women in policing. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 19(3), 235-250. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974450903001594>
15. Geppert, K. (2022). Explaining the gender gap in the criminal justice system: How family-based gender roles shape perceptions of defendants in criminal court. *Inquiries Journal*, 14(02). <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/1936/explaining-the-gender-gap-in-the-criminal-justice-system-how-family-based-gender-roles>
16. Hsieh, M., & Boateng, F. D. (2020). When women work at the iron cage: Gendered perceptions on workplace justice. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 30(6), 480-495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2020.1785371>

17. Johnson, R. L., Smith, A. T., & Nguyen, P. (2021). Demographic influences on gender perceptions among criminal justice students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 32(1), 23–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2020.1812345>
18. Johnson, R. & Tripett, L. (2020). Demographic influences on gender perceptions among criminal justice university students. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 36(1), 72–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2007.12.0>
19. Liang, B., Liu, J., Lu, H., & Tuo, Z. (2024). A study of gender differences on Chinese criminal justice practitioners' death penalty opinions. *Women & Criminal Justice*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974454.2024.2358814>
20. McCarty, M. K., & Burt, A. H. (2024). Understanding perceptions of gender non-binary people: Consensual and unique stereotypes and prejudice. *Sex Roles*, 90(3), 392–416. McCombes, S. (2024). What Is a research design | Types, guide & examples. *Scribbr*. Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/research-design/>
21. Maglinte Sr., B., & Gempes, G. (2021). The moderating effect of self - Regulation on the relationship between public service motivation and well - Being of Philippine national police personnel. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 9(4), 837–842. <https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/12772>
22. Miller, J., & Lundgren, S. (2019). Relationship status and gender role attitudes in criminal justice students: A comparative analysis. *Criminal Justice and Social Behavior*, 46(4), 567–583. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854819834567>
23. Morash, M., Kashy, D. A., Smith, S., & Cobbina, J. E. (2021). Changes in criminal justice students' attitudes toward women in law enforcement: The impact of academic progression and exposure. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 32(3), 355–373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2020.1798105>
24. Pina, A., & Gannon, T. A. (2020). Student attitudes toward gender equality in criminal justice professions: The influence of academic year and perceived barriers. *Feminism & Psychology*, 29(4), 453–471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353519852201>
25. Post, C., Lokshin, B., & Boone, C. (2022). What changes after women enter top management teams? A gender-based model of strategic renewal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(1), 273–303. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2018.1039>
26. Rahman, A. (2022). Gender issues in criminal justice system: An analysis. *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*, 1(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.34762.64969>
27. Santos, R. & Lacuesta, M. (2022). Gender, the law and criminal justice policy. *Gender, Crime and Criminal Justice*, 185–208. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781843924180-14>
28. Shore, L. M., Cleveland, J. N., & Sanchez, D. (2022). Inclusive workplaces: A longitudinal study of gender and diversity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(4), 987–1010. <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amj.2021.0321>
29. Smith, T. (2010). Attitudes toward criminal justice policies: Further evidence against the “Gender gap”. *Gender and Crime*, 210–228. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003305040-12>
30. Stringer, E., DeFeo, S., Munoz Arias, G., & Murphy, J. (2022). The impact of gender on social support for criminal justice careers. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 34(2), 231–249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2022.2079145>
31. Temizel, G. (2022). The relationship among perceived gender discrimination, job satisfaction, and turnover intention and the moderator role of gender. *Advances in Hospitality, Tourism, and the Services Industry*, 24–55. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-4194-7.ch003>
32. Thomas, L. (2023). Stratified sampling | definition, guide & examples. *Scribbr*. Retrieved from <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/stratified-sampling/>
33. Villanueva, L. (2020). Impact of perceived parental leave policies on female employees' job satisfaction and organizational commitment: Mediating effect of job satisfaction. *International Trade Research Institute*, 20(1), 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.16980/jitc.20.1.202402.37>
34. Villegas, J., Biol, R., Simbahon, J., & Dacullo, J. (2022). Gender, numbers and beyond: The case of criminology program in DOrSU, city of Mati, Philippines. *Davao Research Journal*, 13(1), 6–19 <https://doi.org/10.59120/drj.v13i1.1>

35. Whaley, R. B. (2024). Feminist theory. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.013.91> <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-024-01449-2>

## SPS OUTPUTS

### Sex

|            | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Male | 212       | 76.3    | 76.3          | 76.3               |
| Female     | 66        | 23.7    | 23.7          | 100.0              |
| Total      | 278       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Age

|                      | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid 18-20 yrs. Old | 129       | 46.4    | 46.4          | 46.4               |
| 21-23 yrs. Old       | 143       | 51.4    | 51.4          | 97.8               |
| 24-26 yrs. Old       | 6         | 2.2     | 2.2           | 100.0              |
| Total                | 278       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Year

|                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid First Year | 60        | 21.6    | 21.6          | 21.6               |
| Second Year      | 68        | 24.5    | 24.5          | 46.0               |
| Third Year       | 91        | 32.7    | 32.7          | 78.8               |
| Fourth Year      | 59        | 21.2    | 21.2          | 100.0              |
| Total            | 278       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Tribe

|              | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid Bisaya | 269       | 96.8    | 96.8          | 96.8               |
| B'laan       | 2         | .7      | .7            | 97.5               |
| Bagobo       | 3         | 1.1     | 1.1           | 98.6               |
| Others       | 4         | 1.4     | 1.4           | 100.0              |
| Total        | 278       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

### Status

|       |        | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Single | 214       | 77.0    | 77.0          | 77.0               |
|       | Dating | 64        | 23.0    | 23.0          | 100.0              |
|       | Total  | 278       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

| Descriptive Statistics |     |         |         |      |                |
|------------------------|-----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
|                        | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| Q1                     | 278 | 2.0     | 5.0     | 4.59 | 0.57           |
| Q2                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 4.25 | 0.95           |
| Q3                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.42 | 1.26           |
| Q4                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 4.27 | 0.93           |
| Q5                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.92 | 1.03           |
| Q6                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.04 | 1.41           |
| Q7                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 4.06 | 1.13           |
| Q8                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.83 | 1.29           |
| Q9                     | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.99 | 1.15           |
| Q10                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 2.20 | 1.21           |
| Q11                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 1.77 | 0.85           |
| Q12                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 1.90 | 1.07           |
| Q13                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 2.05 | 1.20           |
| Q14                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 2.40 | 1.45           |
| Q15                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 1.99 | 1.08           |
| Q16                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 2.29 | 1.40           |
| Q17                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.04 | 1.43           |
| Q18                    | 277 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.75 | 1.30           |
| Q19                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 4.20 | 1.02           |
| Q20                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 3.90 | 1.26           |
| Q21                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 2.46 | 1.31           |
| Q22                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 2.01 | 1.22           |
| Q23                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 1.88 | 1.01           |
| Q24                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 4.00 | 1.04           |
| Q25                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 1.76 | 0.91           |
| Q26                    | 278 | 1.0     | 5.0     | 1.62 | 0.60           |
| overall                | 277 | 2.077   | 4.615   | 3.02 | 0.38           |
| Valid N (listwise)     | 277 |         |         |      |                |

| Tests of Normality |                                 |     |      |              |     |      |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-----|------|--------------|-----|------|
|                    | Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup> |     |      | Shapiro-Wilk |     |      |
|                    | Statistic                       | Df  | Sig. | Statistic    | df  | Sig. |
| overall            | .104                            | 277 | .000 | .893         | 277 | .000 |

## a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

| Ranks   |                |     |           |
|---------|----------------|-----|-----------|
| Age     |                | N   | Mean Rank |
| overall | 18-20 yrs. Old | 129 | 139.30    |
|         | 21-23 yrs. Old | 142 | 137.69    |
|         | 24-26 yrs. Old | 6   | 163.58    |
|         | Total          | 277 |           |

| Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup> |         |
|--------------------------------|---------|
|                                | overall |
| Chi-Square                     | .606    |
| df                             | 2       |
| Asymp. Sig.                    | .739    |
| a. Kruskal Wallis Test         |         |
| b. Grouping Variable: Age      |         |

| Ranks   |        |     |           |              |
|---------|--------|-----|-----------|--------------|
| Sex     |        | N   | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
| overall | Male   | 212 | 147.13    | 31192.00     |
|         | Female | 65  | 112.48    | 7311.00      |
|         | Total  | 277 |           |              |

| Test Statistics <sup>a</sup> |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
|                              | overall  |
| Mann-Whitney U               | 5166.000 |
| Wilcoxon W                   | 7311.000 |
| Z                            | -3.054   |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)       | .002     |
| a. Grouping Variable: Sex    |          |

| Ranks   |             |     |           |
|---------|-------------|-----|-----------|
| Year    |             | N   | Mean Rank |
| overall | First Year  | 60  | 184.29    |
|         | Second Year | 68  | 98.43     |
|         | Third Year  | 90  | 138.78    |
|         | Fourth Year | 59  | 140.04    |
|         | Total       | 277 |           |

| Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup> |         |
|--------------------------------|---------|
|                                | overall |
| Chi-Square                     | 36.698  |
| df                             | 3       |
| Asymp. Sig.                    | .000    |
| a. Kruskal Wallis Test         |         |
| b. Grouping Variable: Year     |         |

| Tribe   |        | N   | Mean Rank |
|---------|--------|-----|-----------|
| overall | Bisaya | 268 | 136.46    |
|         | B'laan | 2   | 193.00    |
|         | Bagobo | 3   | 213.67    |
|         | Others | 4   | 226.50    |
|         | Total  | 277 |           |

| Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup> |         |
|--------------------------------|---------|
|                                | overall |
| Chi-Square                     | 8.573   |
| df                             | 3       |
| Asymp. Sig.                    | .036    |
| a. Kruskal Wallis Test         |         |
| b. Grouping Variable: Tribe    |         |

| Ranks   |        |     |           |              |
|---------|--------|-----|-----------|--------------|
| Status  |        | N   | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
| overall | Single | 213 | 141.04    | 30041.00     |

|  |        |     |        |         |
|--|--------|-----|--------|---------|
|  | Dating | 64  | 132.22 | 8462.00 |
|  | Total  | 277 |        |         |

| Test Statistics <sup>a</sup> |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
|                              | overall  |
| Mann-Whitney U               | 6382.000 |
| Wilcoxon W                   | 8462.000 |
| Z                            | -.773    |
| Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)       | .440     |
| a. Grouping Variable: Status |          |