

Gender-Inclusive Practices and Organizational Culture in Public Elementary Schools in the Division of Manila: Basis for a Proposed Continuous Development Initiatives

Marian Joy E. Corpuz

Graduate School, Eulogio “Amang” Rodriguez Institute of Science and Technology, Manila, Philippines.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100701085>

Received: 06 August 2026; Accepted: 11 August 2026; Published: 21 August 2026

ABSTRACT

Gender-inclusive education depends not only on policy implementation but also on an organizational culture that sustains equity, participation, safety, and inclusive learning. This study examined gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture in public elementary schools in the Division of Manila, Philippines, focusing on stakeholder differences, their multivariate associations, implementation challenges, and the acceptability of a proposed Continuous Development Initiative. A quantitative descriptive–comparative–correlational design was employed involving 439 respondents composed of supervisors, school heads, Gender and Development (GAD) focal persons, and teachers. Findings revealed that gender-inclusive practices were highly evident, with policy and governance, curriculum and instruction, and teacher training and development emerging as the strongest dimensions. Organizational culture was likewise highly evident, particularly in values and beliefs and leadership and management style. Aggregate-level comparisons showed significant differences among respondent groups across gender-inclusive dimensions, with large effect sizes. Regression analyses demonstrated significant multivariate associations between gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture, accounting for substantial variance in the models. Implementation challenges were moderately encountered, while the proposed Continuous Development Initiative was highly acceptable. Findings underscore the importance of supportive leadership, professional development, adequate resources, and systematic monitoring in sustaining gender-responsive school environments. Although strong associations were identified, the correlational design does not permit causal conclusions.

Keywords: gender-inclusive practices; organizational culture; gender-responsive education; inclusive leadership; school governance; gender and development

INTRODUCTION

Education serves as a fundamental mechanism for advancing social equity, inclusion, and sustainable development by ensuring that all learners have equal opportunities to participate in quality learning experiences. Globally, gender equality in education has become a central priority under the United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which emphasizes inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all. International frameworks, including the UNESCO Strategy for Gender Equality in and through Education, highlight that achieving gender equality requires more than policy adoption; it requires institutional transformation reflected in teaching practices, school leadership, learning environments, and organizational systems.

In the Philippine education system, gender responsiveness has been integrated into educational reforms through policies such as DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2017, or the Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy, which promotes gender sensitivity, equality, and non-discrimination in schools. Similarly, DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012, or the Child Protection Policy, emphasizes the creation of safe and inclusive learning environments. However, despite these policy commitments, ensuring consistent implementation of gender-inclusive practices remains a challenge. Differences in institutional capacity, leadership support, monitoring mechanisms, and school-level practices continue to influence how gender-responsive policies are translated into actual educational experiences.

The implementation of gender-inclusive practices is particularly relevant in public elementary schools where diverse learner needs require responsive institutional approaches. Existing studies have largely examined gender responsiveness through teacher competencies, curriculum strategies, or policy compliance. However, limited attention has been given to the organizational conditions that sustain gender-inclusive practices. Since schools' function as complex social organizations, their internal culture—including leadership behaviors, shared values, communication systems, and accountability structures may significantly influence how gender equality initiatives are understood, implemented, and maintained.

Organizational culture provides an important lens for understanding the sustainability of gender-inclusive practices. A school culture characterized by inclusive leadership, collaboration, transparent communication, professional development, and stakeholder engagement can strengthen the institutionalization of gender-responsive initiatives. Conversely, weak organizational support and limited commitment may hinder the effectiveness of gender-related programs despite the existence of formal policies. Thus, examining organizational culture offers valuable insights into how schools transform gender equality principles into everyday institutional practices.

This study is anchored on the Gender Transformative Education Framework proposed by the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative, Plan International, and Oxfam (2021), and Schein's Organizational Culture Theory. The Gender Transformative Education Framework emphasizes that education should move beyond equal access toward transforming discriminatory norms, stereotypes, and unequal power relations within educational systems. It highlights the importance of reforming curriculum, pedagogy, leadership, learner support systems, and community engagement to achieve meaningful gender equality. Meanwhile, Schein's Organizational Culture Theory explains that institutional behaviors are shaped by shared values, assumptions, norms, and practices that influence how members respond to organizational goals. Together, these perspectives provide a comprehensive foundation for examining how school culture supports the implementation of gender-inclusive practices.

Although previous research has explored gender-responsive education and organizational factors in schools, limited empirical evidence explains how organizational culture directly influences gender-inclusive practices, particularly in Philippine public elementary schools. Existing studies have frequently focused on policy implementation or individual teacher-level practices, creating a gap in understanding the institutional mechanisms that sustain gender responsiveness. Addressing this gap is essential for developing evidence-based strategies that strengthen inclusive school systems.

Therefore, this study examined the relationship between gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture in public elementary schools. Specifically, it investigated the perceptions of supervisors, school heads, Gender and Development (GAD) focal persons, and teachers to determine how organizational culture contributes to the implementation of gender-responsive practices. The findings provide empirical insights for educational leaders and policymakers in developing sustainable intervention strategies that promote equitable, safe, and inclusive learning environments.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quantitative, descriptive–comparative–correlational research design to examine the relationship between gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture in public elementary schools as the basis for a proposed intervention program. The descriptive component determined the extent of implementation of gender-inclusive practices and the level of organizational culture within schools. The comparative component examined differences in the assessments of supervisors, Gender and Development (GAD) focal persons, school heads, and teachers. Meanwhile, the correlational component analyzed the relationship between organizational culture dimensions and gender-inclusive practices. This design was appropriate as it examined existing school conditions and naturally occurring relationships among variables without manipulation.

The study involved 439 respondents from selected public elementary schools in the Division of Manila, consisting of 15 supervisors, 34 Gender and Development (GAD) focal persons, 34 school heads, and 356 teachers. The sample size for teacher respondents was determined using Slovin's formula from the total teacher

population of 3,184. Total enumeration sampling was used for supervisors, GAD focal persons, and school heads due to their specific leadership roles, involvement in gender-responsive programs, and direct participation in policy implementation and monitoring. Meanwhile, simple random sampling was applied to teacher respondents to provide equal opportunities for selection and ensure fair representation of the larger teacher population.

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed from relevant literature, theoretical frameworks, and the objectives of the study. The instrument consisted of measures on respondent characteristics, gender-inclusive practices, organizational culture, and areas requiring institutional improvement. The major variables were assessed using a five-point Likert scale. Content validity was established through expert evaluation, while pilot testing was conducted to determine the reliability and internal consistency of the research instrument before the final administration.

Ethical standards for research involving human participants were strictly observed throughout the conduct of the study. Respondents were informed about the purpose, procedures, and significance of the research, including their voluntary participation and right to withdraw at any stage. Informed consent was obtained prior to data collection, while confidentiality, anonymity, and responsible handling of information were maintained. The collected data were used solely for research purposes, and results were presented in aggregate form to protect the identity and privacy of participants. Necessary permissions and institutional approvals were secured before the conduct of the study.

Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Frequency and percentage distributions were used to describe the demographic characteristics of respondents, while weighted mean, standard deviation, and rank were utilized to summarize the assessments of gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture. One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine significant differences among the assessments of the four respondent groups, with post hoc analysis applied when significant differences were identified. Multiple linear regression analysis was performed to determine the predictive influence of organizational culture dimensions on gender-inclusive practices. All statistical tests were evaluated at the 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Gender-Inclusive Practices

Table 1. Assessment of Gender-Inclusive Practices

Criterion	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	GAD Focal	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Policy and Governance	4.39	HE	4.69	HE	4.67	HE	4.5	HE	4.56	HE	1
Curriculum and Instruction	4.36	HE	4.75	HE	4.53	HE	4.52	HE	4.54	HE	2
Teacher Training and Development	4.31	HE	4.75	HE	4.54	HE	4.46	HE	4.52	HE	3
School Environment and Facilities	4.16	E	4.7	HE	4.62	HE	4.47	HE	4.49	HE	5
Support and Participation	4.28	HE	4.67	HE	4.59	HE	4.48	HE	4.5	HE	4
Family and Community Engagement	4.1	E	4.49	HE	4.43	HE	4.31	HE	4.33	HE	8
Monitoring and Evaluation	3.9	E	4.61	HE	4.53	HE	4.39	HE	4.36	HE	7
Inclusive Assessment and Recognition	4.14	E	4.68	HE	4.59	HE	4.49	HE	4.48	HE	6

Overall weighted mean	4.21	HE	4.67	HE	4.56	HE	4.45	HE	4.47	HE	—
-----------------------	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	------	----	---

Gender-inclusive practices were Highly Evident overall (WM = 4.47). Policy and governance ranked first (WM = 4.56), followed by curriculum and instruction (WM = 4.54) and teacher training and development (WM = 4.52). These results indicate that gender responsiveness is most strongly manifested through institutional policy, classroom practice, and capacity-building mechanisms. Family and community engagement (WM = 4.33) and monitoring and evaluation (WM = 4.36) received the lowest composite ratings, identifying stakeholder participation and systematic evaluation as relative priorities for further development.

The pattern supports a whole-school approach in which policy, teaching, professional learning, school conditions, and accountability mechanisms operate together. DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2017 similarly emphasizes integration of gender responsiveness across governance, curriculum, learning environments, participation, and monitoring.

Differences in Respondent-Group Assessments

Table 2. Aggregate-Level Comparison of Gender-Inclusive Practices

Dimension	<i>F</i> (3, 20)	<i>p</i>	η^2	Interpretation
Policy and Governance	34.86	< .001	.840	Significant
Curriculum and Instruction	29.54	< .001	.816	Significant
Teacher Training and Development	36.16	< .001	.844	Significant
School Environment and Facilities	23.06	< .001	.776	Significant
Support and Participation	13.50	< .001	.669	Significant
Family and Community Engagement	18.41	< .001	.734	Significant
Monitoring and Evaluation	40.79	< .001	.860	Significant
Inclusive Assessment and Recognition	72.87	< .001	.916	Significant

Note. *p* values and η^2 were recalculated from the reported ANOVA statistics. The *df* structure indicates aggregate-level analysis. All η^2 values indicate large effects.

Significant aggregate-level differences were observed across all eight dimensions (all *p* < .001), with η^2 values ranging from .669 to .916. The largest between-group variation occurred in inclusive assessment and recognition (η^2 = .916), followed by monitoring and evaluation (η^2 = .860) and teacher training and development (η^2 = .844). These effect sizes indicate that the observed differences were not only statistically significant but also substantial in magnitude at the aggregate level.

Table 3. Tukey-Kramer Pairwise Summary for Gender-Inclusive Practices

Dimension	Significant pairwise differences	Not significant
Policy and Governance	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-T; GAD-T	SH-GAD
Curriculum and Instruction	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-GAD; SH-T	GAD-T
Teacher Training and Development	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-GAD; SH-T	GAD-T
School Environment and Facilities	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-T	SH-GAD; GAD-T
Support and Participation	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-T	SH-GAD; GAD-T
Family and Community Engagement	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-T	SH-GAD; GAD-T
Monitoring and Evaluation	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-T	SH-GAD; GAD-T
Inclusive Assessment and Recognition	S-SH; S-GAD; S-T; SH-T	SH-GAD; GAD-T

Note. S = supervisors; SH = school heads; GAD = GAD focal persons; T = teachers. Tukey-Kramer critical value: *q*(4, 20) $\approx$ 3.96 at α = .05.

The Tukey-Kramer post hoc comparisons showed that supervisors differed significantly from school heads, GAD focal persons, and teachers across all eight dimensions. School heads also differed significantly from teachers across all dimensions. In contrast, school heads and GAD focal persons were statistically similar in six

of the eight dimensions, while GAD focal persons and teachers were statistically similar in seven dimensions. This pattern indicates that perceptions of gender-inclusive practices vary across organizational roles, with the most consistent differences occurring between supervisory and school-based assessments. These findings underscore the need for shared implementation standards, clearer alignment of expectations, and stronger feedback mechanisms among supervisory and school-based personnel (Duma, 2022; Hemillan-Sacro et al., 2022; Lomibao, 2024).

Organizational Culture

Table 4. Assessment of Organizational Culture

Criterion	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	GAD Focal	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Values and Beliefs	4.47	HE	4.8	HE	4.79	HE	4.63	HE	4.67	HE	1
Leadership and Management Style	4.4	HE	4.81	HE	4.78	HE	4.58	HE	4.64	HE	2
Communication Patterns	4.4	HE	4.8	HE	4.71	HE	4.61	HE	4.63	HE	3.5
Work Environment	4.24	HE	4.79	HE	4.61	HE	4.57	HE	4.55	HE	5
Professional Development and Learning	4.41	HE	4.81	HE	4.7	HE	4.59	HE	4.63	HE	3.5
Policy and Implementation	4.03	E	4.66	HE	4.65	HE	4.5	HE	4.46	HE	6
Stakeholder Engagement	3.93	E	4.68	HE	4.6	HE	4.47	HE	4.42	HE	7
Overall weighted mean	4.27	HE	4.75	HE	4.69	HE	4.56	HE	4.6	HE	—

Organizational culture was Highly Evident overall (WM = 4.60). Values and beliefs ranked first (WM = 4.67), followed by leadership and management style (WM = 4.64), while communication patterns and professional development and learning both obtained WM = 4.63. These findings indicate strong shared institutional norms, supportive leadership, communication, and professional-learning conditions.

Stakeholder engagement (WM = 4.42) and policy and implementation (WM = 4.46) ranked lowest, although both remained positively assessed. These areas therefore represent the clearest opportunities for strengthening the institutional conditions that sustain gender responsiveness. The pattern is consistent with Schein and Schein (2017), who describe organizational culture as a system of shared assumptions, leadership practices, communication, and learned organizational behavior.

Multivariate Association Between Gender-Inclusive Practices and Organizational Culture

Table 5. Omnibus Regression Models Reported for the Two Study Constructs

Reported model	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Residual SE	F	df	p
Gender-inclusive practices → organizational culture	0.7864	0.7678	0.2465	42.39	-35,403	< .001
Organizational culture → gender-inclusive practices	0.7923	0.7691	0.2229	34.16	-44,394	< .001

Note. Only omnibus regression statistics were available; therefore, the results are interpreted as overall associations rather than dimension-specific or causal effects.

Both omnibus regression models were statistically significant. The model relating gender-inclusive practices to organizational culture explained 78.64% of the variance, $R^2 = .7864$, adjusted $R^2 = .7678$, $F(35, 403) = 42.39$, $p < .001$. The second model similarly accounted for approximately 79% of the variance, indicating a strong

multivariate association between gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture. Taken together, the results indicate that higher reported levels of gender-inclusive practices were associated with more favorable assessments of organizational culture.

However, the omnibus model statistics do not identify the independent contributions of specific dimensions because predictor-level coefficients were not available. Dimension-specific interpretations would require individual regression coefficients (B or β), standard errors, test statistics, p values, confidence intervals, and appropriate multicollinearity diagnostics. Given the cross-sectional, nonexperimental design, the findings should therefore be interpreted as evidence of association rather than causal or reciprocal effects. Consistent with Schein and Schein (2017), the results suggest that gender-responsive implementation is closely associated with the broader organizational environment.

Challenges in Implementing Gender-Inclusive Practices

Table 6. Challenges Encountered by Respondents

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	GAD Focal	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Insufficient pre-service preparation in gender sensitivity and inclusive pedagogy	3.27	ME	2.76	ME	2.85	ME	2.89	ME	2.94	ME	1
Limited continuing professional development on gender-related issues	3.20	ME	2.62	ME	2.88	ME	2.89	ME	2.9	ME	2
Gender-inclusive policies lack sufficiently specific guidelines	3.27	ME	2.53	LE	2.65	ME	2.84	ME	2.82	ME	5
Inconsistent application of gender-inclusive policy	3.13	ME	2.39	LE	2.50	LE	2.76	ME	2.7	ME	7.5
Instructional materials may perpetuate gender stereotypes	3.07	ME	2.71	ME	2.79	ME	2.79	ME	2.84	ME	3
Shortage of diverse and inclusive learning resources	3.00	ME	2.59	LE	2.74	ME	2.83	ME	2.79	ME	6
Facilities do not fully accommodate all learners' needs	3.33	ME	2.44	LE	2.71	ME	2.83	ME	2.83	ME	4
Insufficient safe spaces for gender-based discrimination or harassment concerns	3.27	ME	2.26	LE	2.50	LE	2.78	ME	2.70	ME	7.5
Parent/community resistance to gender-inclusive initiatives	3.07	ME	2.26	LE	2.53	LE	2.70	ME	2.64	ME	10
Traditional gender expectations challenge implementation	3.00	ME	2.24	LE	2.53	LE	2.78	ME	2.63	ME	11
Lack of systematic monitoring of gender-inclusive implementation	3.07	ME	2.21	LE	2.56	LE	2.65	ME	2.62	ME	12
No sufficiently clear indicators for program effectiveness	3.27	ME	2.18	LE	2.56	LE	2.68	ME	2.67	ME	9

Gender inclusivity is not consistently prioritized as a schoolwide goal	2.93	ME	2.09	LE	2.47	LE	2.59	LE	2.52	LE	13
Insufficient leadership direction for gender-inclusive practice	2.93	ME	2.09	LE	2.50	LE	2.53	LE	2.51	LE	14
Overall weighted mean	3.13	ME	2.38	LE	2.63	ME	2.75	ME	2.72	ME	—

Challenges were Moderately Encountered overall (WM = 2.72). The leading concerns were insufficient teacher preparation (WM = 2.94), limited continuing professional development (WM = 2.90), gender bias in instructional materials (WM = 2.84), and facilities that do not fully accommodate all learners' needs (WM = 2.83). Policy specificity, inclusive resources, safe spaces, community resistance, and monitoring mechanisms were also identified as areas requiring attention.

The findings indicate that strong reported implementation does not eliminate operational gaps. Sustaining gender responsiveness requires continuing capability development, review of learning resources, inclusive facilities and support systems, clearer implementation guidance, and evidence-based monitoring. Duma (2022) likewise identified training, mainstreaming mechanisms, and institutional support as important conditions for gender-responsive implementation.

Proposed Continuous Development Initiative

Based on the findings, the Continuous Development Initiative is designed to reinforce existing strengths in policy, curriculum, leadership, communication, and professional learning while addressing the most prominent challenges in teacher preparation, resources, facilities, stakeholder engagement, and monitoring. The initiative is intended to be integrated into existing GAD, school-improvement, professional-development, learner-protection, and stakeholder-engagement mechanisms rather than implemented as a separate stand-alone program.

Table 7. Illustrative Continuous Development Initiative Activities

Key Result Area	Illustrative Activity	Implementation Strategy	Performance Evidence
Policy Alignment and Shared Governance	Gender-Inclusive Policy Calibration and Implementation Review	Conduct periodic school-level review of gender-related guidelines, clarify responsibilities, align grade-level implementation, and use common implementation checklists among supervisors, school heads, and GAD focal persons.	Updated guidelines; implementation checklist; review minutes; compliance/action log
Teacher Capability and Inclusive Resources	Gender-Responsive Teaching and Resource Development Cycle	Provide focused learning sessions on gender sensitivity and inclusive pedagogy; review textbooks, modules, assessments, and visual materials; develop or curate inclusive teaching resources.	Training outputs; reviewed materials; resource bank; classroom-use evidence
Inclusive Environment and Learner Support	Safe and Inclusive School Environment Audit	Review restrooms, guidance/wellness spaces, reporting mechanisms, and learner-support pathways; prioritize feasible improvements based on identified access and safety needs.	Facility audit; improvement plan; referral/reporting protocol; completion records

Stakeholder Co-ownership	Family and Community Gender Dialogue Series	Engage parents, guardians, PTA officers, community partners, and learners through orientations, consultations, and feedback activities that explain school gender-responsiveness goals and address misconceptions.	Attendance; consultation summaries; partnership commitments; stakeholder feedback
Monitoring and Sustainability	Quarterly Gender-Inclusion Pulse Review	Use clear indicators, gender-disaggregated information where appropriate, implementation evidence, and stakeholder feedback to review progress, identify gaps, and agree on corrective actions.	Quarterly dashboard; corrective-action log; monitoring report; improvement decisions

Acceptability of the Proposed Initiative

Table 8. Acceptability of the Proposed Continuous Development Initiative

Indicator	Supervisors	VI	School Heads	VI	GAD Focal	VI	Teachers	VI	Composite	VI	Rank
Provides completeness of relevant facts	4.33	HA	4.56	HA	4.68	HA	4.33	HA	4.47	HA	4
Practical enough to warrant adoption and implementation	4.33	HA	4.47	HA	4.65	HA	4.26	HA	4.43	HA	5
Helps identify weaknesses in gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture	4.33	HA	4.56	HA	4.65	HA	4.4	HA	4.48	HA	3
Guides development and enhancement of policy guidelines	4.40	HA	4.56	HA	4.68	HA	4.39	HA	4.51	HA	1.5
Provides knowledge for implementing corrective actions	4.40	HA	4.56	HA	4.68	HA	4.38	HA	4.51	HA	1.5
Overall weighted mean	4.36	HA	4.54	HA	4.66	HA	4.35	HA	4.48	HA	—

The proposed initiative was Highly Acceptable overall (WM = 4.48). Its strongest ratings concerned policy guidance and knowledge for corrective action (both WM = 4.51), followed by its value in identifying institutional weaknesses (WM = 4.48). Practicality ranked lowest (WM = 4.43) but remained Highly Acceptable. The results indicate strong perceived relevance and usability; however, acceptability is evidence of stakeholder appraisal, not proof of intervention effectiveness. Pilot implementation should therefore include clear timelines, responsibilities, resource requirements, fidelity indicators, and outcome measures.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Gender-inclusive practices are strongly manifested in public elementary schools in the Division of Manila, indicating that schools have already established a generally supportive environment for gender-responsive education.
2. The assessments of the four groups of respondents significantly differ, indicating that supervisors, school heads, Gender and Development focal persons, and teachers do not view the implementation of gender-inclusive practices in the same way. These differences may be influenced by their roles, responsibilities, and level of direct involvement in school operations.
3. The organizational culture in public elementary schools in the Division of Manila strongly supports gender inclusivity through shared values, inclusive leadership, respectful communication, professional development, and a supportive work environment. However, stakeholder engagement and policy implementation may still be further strengthened.
4. Organizational culture is meaningfully associated with gender-inclusive practices. This means that gender-responsive initiatives are more likely to be sustained when schools have supportive leadership, clear communication, shared values, and effective monitoring and evaluation systems.
5. Schools still face moderate challenges in teacher preparation, continuing professional development, instructional materials, facilities, policy clarity, safe spaces, inclusive resources, and monitoring systems.
6. The Proposed Continuous Development Initiatives is a relevant response to the findings of the study because it provides organized strategies for addressing the identified gaps in gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture.
7. The Proposed Continuous Development Initiatives is suitable for adoption in public elementary schools in the Division of Manila because it was assessed as highly acceptable by the respondents and was viewed as useful in guiding policy enhancement, corrective action, and school-based improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The School head, in coordination with supervisors, may consider adopting the Proposed Continuous Development Initiatives as a guide for strengthening gender-inclusive practices and organizational culture in public elementary schools.
2. School heads and Gender and Development focal persons may strengthen gender-inclusive policies by ensuring that guidelines are clearly written, accessible, properly disseminated, and consistently implemented across grade levels and departments.
3. Supervisors, school heads, and teacher leaders may provide more regular and focused training on gender sensitivity, inclusive pedagogy, and gender-responsive classroom practices to address the need for stronger teacher preparation and continuing professional development.
4. Teachers, school leaders, and learning resource teams may regularly review textbooks, modules, visual aids, assessment tools, and other instructional materials to reduce gender bias and promote fair and diverse gender representation.
5. School administrators, in coordination with Parent-Teacher Associations, local government units, and relevant committees, may improve school facilities and learner support systems, particularly restrooms, guidance areas, wellness corners, reporting mechanisms, and other safe spaces.
6. School heads and Gender and Development focal persons may strengthen monitoring and evaluation by developing clear indicators, gathering gender-disaggregated data, reviewing implementation results, and using the findings to improve school-based gender-inclusive practices.
7. Parents, guardians, and community stakeholders may be more actively involved through orientations, dialogues, workshops, and partnership activities that promote gender awareness, reduce resistance, and strengthen support for inclusive education.
8. Supervisors and school heads may continue to nurture a positive organizational culture by promoting inclusive values, open communication, fair leadership practices, professional development, and shared accountability among teachers, staff, learners, and stakeholders.
9. Future researchers may conduct similar studies in other school divisions, grade levels, or educational contexts. They may also explore related variables such as learner outcomes, school leadership practices, parental involvement, long-term intervention implementation, and the sustainability of gender-responsive programs.

REFERENCES

1. Department of Education. (2012). *DepEd Child Protection Policy (DepEd Order No. 40, s. 2012)*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
2. Department of Education. (2017). *Gender-responsive basic education policy (DepEd Order No. 32, s. 2017)*. Department of Education, Republic of the Philippines.
3. Duma, M. G. (2022). Gender mainstreaming plan for gender-responsive public schools. *PUPIL: International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning*, 5(3), 144–161. <https://doi.org/10.20319/pijtel.2022.53.144161>
4. Hemillan-Sacro, J., Bauyot, M. F. M., & Villegas, J. P. (2022). Gender mainstreaming in basic education of the City of Mati, Southern Mindanao, Philippines. *Davao Research Journal*, 13(1), 30–49. <https://doi.org/10.59120/drj.v13i1.3>
5. Lomibao, C. R. D. (2024). Implementation of gender-responsive basic education policy in the secondary public schools. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 8(3S), 5831–5871. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2024.803438S>
6. Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
7. UNESCO. (2019). *From access to empowerment: UNESCO strategy for gender equality in and through education 2019–2025*.
8. United Nations Girls' Education Initiative, Plan International, & Oxfam. (2021). *Gender Transformative Education Framework*