

RESEARCH ARTICLE: Analysis on the awareness index of physical education teachers and students on gender sensitivity

Wendylene D. Miñao^{1*}

¹Department of Education, Zamboanga City Philippines

*Corresponding author: wendylenemiñao@gmail.com

Abstract. Gender-sensitive environments should be constantly provided by educational institutions for the people who are on campus. In particular, when it comes to how they conduct the teaching and learning processes for their pupils, educators need to be conscious of their obligations to provide gender-sensitive concepts among themselves. The PE Teachers and Students Awareness to Gender Sensitivity Survey was used in the study. This study showed that gender affected perception differences and the communication process. According to accounts, women tend to view communication as a crucial aspect of gender sensitivity, however men may also harbor prejudices against women based only on their sexual orientation. Gender also influenced the perception of the respondents where males were more pessimistic in achieving gender sensitive institution. Another factor that affects the Communication Process where different ages were shown to be onwards for gender-sensitive classrooms. Age brackets believed that the students and teachers have to be supportive for gender identity of an individual as they prefer a certain sport or activity. They believe this will not limit their capacity to be an athlete. However, the age brackets is also unsure if the institution will achieve a gender-sensitive setting because they believe there is still present discrimination to LGBT community. Perceptions were neutral and thus, there is occurrence of harm, bullying, and discrimination.

Keywords: Gender sensitivity, awareness, physical education, students, teachers

ARTICLE DETAILS

SPHE-0005; Received: January 28, 2024; Accepted: February 23, 2024; Online March 16, 2024

CITATION:

Miñao, Wendylene D. (2024). Analysis on the awareness index of physical education teachers and students on gender sensitivity. *Social Psychology and Human Experience*. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.62596/96j82595>.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2024 by author(s). *Social Psychology and Human Experience* is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

Introduction

The educational institutions should consistently provide a gender-sensitive environment for the individuals that are inside the campus. Teachers should be aware of their responsibilities on the provision of gender sensitive concepts among themselves, especially in the conduct of the teaching and learning processes to their students.

Teachers role in students life in school is to ensure that each of the students have equal opportunities to both create and obtain their goals regardless of their sexual orientations. They can inspire and empower students as well as they can also discourage and impose limitations, regardless of whether they are making a conscious effort to do so. In Asia, where millions of girls find themselves either on the sidelines of education or excluded entirely, this role of teachers in perpetuating or actively combating gender inequality is especially critical (UNDP, USAID 2014).

As a gender-mainstreaming method, gender awareness raising is crucial for integrating a gender perspective into policies, programmes, projects and services that respond to the different needs of women and men (Chavez & Cuilan, 2024; EIGE, 2019).

Awareness is a tool to combat inequalities most specially starting from the onset of schools. As Libing Wang, Chief of Section for Educational Innovation and Skills Development

at UNESCO Bangkok, notes, when it comes to addressing gender disparities in education, the role of teachers is of paramount importance.

Gender sensitivity helps to generate respect for the individual regardless of sex. Aksornkool (2004) believes that gender sensitivity is not about pitting women against men. Hence, it is about changing behavior and instilling empathy into the views that we hold about our own and the other genders.

Physical Education has long been recognised as gendered in its philosophy, content, organisational structure and through its association with sport (Garrett, 2004; Rich 2004; Wright, 1999). Research informed by an understanding of gender as socially constructed has shown how teachers play a role in constructing gender and reproducing/producing relations of power through their teaching practices (Wright, 2001).

This approach aligns with a poststructuralist perspective (among others) in that it recognises that what it means to be male or female, masculine or feminine, is socially and historically located and open to change (Azzarito et al., 2006; Rich, 2004; Wright, 1999).

The Department of Education (DepEd) issues the enclosed Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy in line with its Gender and Development (GAD) mandate as stipulated in the 1987 Philippine Constitution, Republic Act (RA) No. 9710 or the *Magna Carta of Women* (MCW), RA 10533 or the *Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013*, and the Philippines' International Human Rights Commitments to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) among others.

Research Questions

This research will determine the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and Students on Gender Sensitivity.

Specifically, this study will be conducted to answer the following questions:

1. What are the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Gender Sensitivity?
2. What are the Level of Awareness of Physical Education students on Gender Sensitivity?
3. Is there a significant association to the level of awareness between the PE teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity?
4. Is there a significant difference in the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity when data are classified according to age and gender?

Literature

Teachers need not only gender sensitive curricula and textbooks but also gender equality education. Teachers can serve as a role models for the students (Sharma, 2017).

A detailed action plan with a definite road map is required in the school curriculum to achieve gender equality. Gender sensitivity training should be mandatory for teachers. The training will enable them to disseminate the desirable attitude based on mutual respect and trust between girls and boys Akash (2018).

With growing concern over the lack of gender sensitization among youth, the Central Board of Secondary Education (CBSE) has developed “a kit on gender sensitivity” for teachers to enable them to ensure unbiased participation of both boys and girls in the learning process Akash (2018).

Gender Sensitive Classrooms

Classrooms need to be gender sensitive. We have to take care of few do's and don'ts for making classroom interaction gender sensitive. Encourage both males and females to be class leaders (perhaps one of each sex). Appoint two monitors in each classroom, a boy and a girl. Address and call on girls and boys equally. Do not segregate boys and girls in the classroom in primary classes. Make mixed groups for group activities and games. Try to 'switch role' for breaking down gender barriers and stereotyping of gender roles. Make both boys and girls share activities like cleaning, moving furniture, to the chalkboard during a lesson. Plan and conduct activities that give opportunity to all children accepting one another as equals.

Gender Sensitivity in Curriculum and text

Government took initiatives regarding gender concerns have been included in the curriculum and in the textbooks drawn up by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT, 2011). This is an alignment of DepEd's Department Order no. 32, series of 2017 as the Department of Education (DepEd) issues the enclosed Gender-Responsive Basic Education Policy in line with its Gender and Development (GAD) mandate as stipulated in the 1987 Philippine Constitution.

Both the terms *gender* and *sex* have been historically interchangeable, but it was not until the late 1960s and early 70s that the term *gender* began to be more thoroughly defined and spread throughout the literature within the field of psychology. Although the term has undergone some changes since then, today it represents how an individual feels and expresses their gender, typically through masculinity or femininity (Diamond, 2000).

Gender has often been used as a variable to study how particular parts of people, (i.e. one's sexuality), can ultimately be informed by gender. Psychological research in this area has tended to follow these three modes of looking at gender: (1) Looking at gender through difference in presentation, actions, and traits; (2) Looking at gender vs. individual difference in individuals who identify as male and individuals who identify as female, and (3) Looking at how gender influences how both men and women operate in society (Chavez, Del Prado, and Estoque, 2023; Stewart & McDermott, 2004).

Culture plays a dominant role in the society's view of gender particularly in the field of education. The concept gender has evolved throughout history as beginning with two gender types: male and female, to heterosexual ("straight" male and female) and homosexuals ("lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual or Intersex") (Lee & Carpenter, 2014).

Campus climate within athletics

Rankin (2017) said historically, athletics programs on college or university campuses might be sources of specific concerns for queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum students. In one of the first studies (Murphy, 2014) to comprehensively explore the perceptions and experiences of student-athletes with regard to campus climate, we developed and tested the Student-Athlete Climate Conceptual Frame, which suggests that individual and institutional characteristics directly influence both how student-athletes experience climate and a variety of educational outcomes unique to student-athletes.

Other studies (McCune, 1974) found that sexual-minority college students were more likely to experience and witness incivility (disrespectful behaviors) and hostility (overt violence), and personal incivility and witnessing hostility were associated with greater odds of problematic drinking.

How athletics departments can help

Weber (2018) said while many of the experiences of LGBTQ student-athletes are similar to the general population, there are several ways in which their lives are very different from their heterosexual peers. Overall, "in-house" harassment, or harassment experienced at practice or similar athletics-related events, whether intentional or not, is the most prevalent kind experienced by our respondents.

Abernethy (2012) said Several gay and lesbian players have succeeded in the college ranks, such as Brian Sims, co-captain of the Bloomsburg University football team, and Sarah Vaillancourt, member of Harvard's women's hockey team. As yet, most of the LGBT college players who have moved on to the professional ranks have been in women's basketball, although lacrosse player Andrew Goldstein of Dartmouth became the nation's first drafted gay player.

Primarily the theoretical concept used in this study is anchored on Gender Equity Awareness Survey (Chavez & Prado, 2023; Virga, 1983) and Gender Equality Evaluation Survey (University of Freiburg, 2002). The diagram shows the parameter and gauge for the awareness of the PE teachers and students on the six components of gender sensitivity.

Communication Process. The findings indicated that as a whole this community college campus is not aware of sexism as defined in the context of this study, and yet in the pilot study we see that students showed more awareness after receiving information on gender equity through an Awareness Workshop. It is therefore concluded, on the information obtained in the pilot study and supported by the Review of the Literature, as well as the students lack of awareness found in the findings in the statistical analysis, that attitudes do and can change with knowledge and awareness, Gender sensitive teaching detects and counter-acts such hidden curricula. Moreover, gender aspects play a role in interactions between teachers and students and among students.

Content in Teaching. Empirical studies show that the binary conception of gender continues to be constructed in teaching (Grossman & Grossman, 1994). The binary conception of gender is problematic because of the attribution of differential judgments and values. Hence, gender equality is a criterion for the quality of teaching (Howie et al., 2002). Personal interest in gender equal teaching can develop as the gender competence and reflections made can be transferred to other professional (e.g., job application) and private situations. Gender equal teaching is not simply applying specific teaching methods. Rather, it means to detect, make aware, and integrate gender issues in relation with your teaching scenario. This questionnaire is thought to help you with this.

Equality Treatment. Dehler et al., (2009) constructed a catalogue of criteria assessing gender equality in teaching). Based on these criteria, we elaborated this instrument for the peer and self-evaluation of gender equality in teaching. Questionnaire for the evaluation of gender equality in teaching University of Fribourg(2002). Categories are are relevant for the concrete teaching context for which you want to evaluate gender equality havez (Chavez, Gregorio, Araneta, Bihag 2024).

Farris (1980) says, mandating that sex stereotyping, bias and discrimination be eliminated by educational programs is like squeezing a marshmallow. Woolever (1982) says, societal myths about what people, as males and females, can and cannot become are hard to unlearn; but teachers who are aware of the possible differential effects of schooling on females and males can take steps to avoid discriminating on the basis of sex. Schools should prepare students realistically for their future, and act to counter some of the social myths which prevent people from acquiring meaningful job training, according to Steiger (1974). She found that schools tended to reinforce the traditional sex-role stereotypes in their course offerings, curriculum, materials, guidance programs and administrative policies (Chavez, Lamorinas, and Ceneciro, 2023). Steiger (1974) also stated, "Women at all educational levels continue to be counseled into traditional jobs, even though those jobs are no longer a good choice.

Vetter and Peterson (1978) wrote that the work discrepancies between females and males would continue to exist until educators move toward more sex affirmative efforts. Educators must learn more about women's participation in education and work and seek means whereby sex bias, stereotyping, and discrimination would be eliminated in educational programs and the labor market. The social categorization framework contains "social identity

theory" and "self categorization theory," both of which aid in comprehending individual social features in a certain behavioral climate, according to (Melton & Cunningham, 2014). To establish the social group, a range of factors can be employed, including but not limited to "demographic indicators, religious beliefs, political opinions, or other distinguishing associations" (Turner, 1987; Melton & Cunningham, 2014). In this study, social groups are formed mostly on the basis of gender (e.g., homosexual, non-binary genders).

LGBT individuals believe their sexual orientation identity is often stigmatized in sport organizations, according to Sartore and Cunningham's (2010) interviews (Melton & Cunningham, 2014).

Individuals conceal social identities for themselves and others, according to the social categorization framework (Melton & Cunningham, 2014), which is discriminatory and abusive to one's capabilities in the context of characterization. Furthermore, because social categorization produces variations in their treatment, respect, and honor, this process promotes gender sensitivity behavior. According to Oakes (1987), two main terms determine social identity characterization: accessibility and fit. The former is a focus on a single social identity (in this case, homosexual gender identities), which is thought to represent all genders in sports. This refers to their abilities and skills, which are dependent on the "norms and expectations" of their social group in the social situation. Fit, as defined by Oakes (1987), was a feeling of belonging to a specific group, which was less common for non-binary gender, especially in sports.

Queer theory "interrogates sexual orientation definitions" in order to normalize sexual equality and identify non-heteronormative behaviour (Green, 2007). This essentially stabilizes gender sensitivity, particularly when it comes to upholding the responsibilities and skills of LGBT people in any field. Sexuality, according to Foucault's (1980) research, is a notion that solely relates to rules based on human viewpoints depending on their wishes while looking into a problem. here is a case can be made for medical intervention to create a new "taxonomic order" for sexuality. However, in sociology, this assertion is practically impossible to make due to a lack of scientific evidence (Green, 2007). Nonetheless, Queer Theory gives researchers a place to "think critically" as they construct fields that include sexuality as a component of a non-discriminatory society.

By challenging our notion of identity, Queer Theory strives to provide coverage for further research toward equality (e.g., binary and non-binary genders). Due to the pervasiveness of sexual marginalization in education, equality has emerged as one of the most important issues that required to be addressed. Queer Theory is against "Old Regime" identities that promote prejudice against non-binary people.

Despite the development of policies, the role of Queer Theory in education remains largely undefined. In understanding the purpose of sexuality, the portion of marginalization is "inseparable" from consciousness and power (Green, 2007). Positivism in opposition to sexuality and gender equality are long-term strategies.

Method

Research Instruments

This study utilized the PE Teachers and students Awareness to Gender Sensitivity Survey: Modified version from Gender Equity Awareness Survey (Virga, 1983) and Gender Equality Evaluation Survey (University of Freiburg, 2002). The questionnaire was composed of 30 validated and dapted Likert Scale survey statements which are categorized into: Communication Process, Equality Treatment, Content in Teaching, School Program for Gender Sensitivity, Gender-sensitive Behavior, and Perception to Gender Sensitivity.

Population and Sampling Procedure

Total enumeration was used for the survey for the teachers. And purposive sampling was used for bothjunior and Senior High Schools students (or 100 students for junior high

school and 100 students for senior high school). The targeted respondents of this study were the PE or MAPEH teachers and students of Talon-Talon and Tetuan District, Zamboanga City. Talon Talon districts includes School A (with 18 PE teachers and 5518 student population), School B (with 5 PE teachers and 2284 student population) and School C from Tetuan District (with 40 PE teachers and 8463 student population)

Validity and Reliability of the Research Instruments

The research instruments were considered standardized instruments. This study made use of a 30-item PE Teachers Awareness and Students to Gender Sensitivity Survey: Modified version from Gender Equity Awareness Survey (Virga, 1983) and Gender Equality Evaluation Survey (University of Freiburg, 2002).

The survey questionnaire was pre-determined to fit to the objectivity of the conduct of the research and the items were based on the anchored parameters of gender sensitivity awareness used by the anchored references. Further assessment was made for the items in the survey to suit to the type of respondents in the area being studied. These items were evaluated by the experts in terms of construction and were subjected to validity by the panel of experts. After gathering the empirical evidences and responses from the pilot testing, the data was analyzed and processed using the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient tool and yielded to 0.983 which means that the items used in the survey questionnaire have relatively high internal consistency at par with the acceptable validity for a research study.

Data Gathering Procedure

All survey questionnaires and answer sheets were checked. The sheets were coded. Respondents were given clear instructions before the conduct of the survey. Everyone were asked if they understood the instructions and were allowed to ask for clarifications.

Data Analysis Procedure

The research was analyzed the data through the use of a survey on the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and Students on Gender Sensitivity which has a quantitative style and Checklist survey with 30 statements which measured the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and Students on Gender Sensitivity of MAPEH teachers from Talon-Talon District and Tetuan District. The data were produced came from appropriate numerical rating (2 or 1) that fitted the statements below according to the respondent's level of awareness on Gender Sensitivity as : 2- Aware; 1- Not Aware

Results

Research Problem 1: What is the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Gender Sensitivity?

Table 1.1 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Communication Process

Statement Number	Communication Process	Mean	Interpretation
1	Students should not be subjected to sexist jokes in any conversation	1.85	High
2	Sexist comments should be avoided in a conversation with students	1.80	High
3	Avoiding the use of jokes making gender-oriented labels	1.79	High
4	Students and Teachers should be aware of the Gender Sensitivity concept	1.89	High
5	Students should be informed of the school's gender and development program and policies	1.83	High
Overall		1.83	High
Legend: Low (1-1.33), Moderate (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)			

Table 1 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Gender Sensitivity for Communication Process.

The overall mean is 1.83 interpreted as high awareness level. In the context of communication, the relevance of verbal and actions of students to gender sensitivity were established in the schools according to the perspective of PE teachers.

Remarkable result was in statement No. 3 which states, “Avoiding the use of jokes making gender-oriented labels”. This yielded a weighted mean average of 1.79 which has an adjectival rating of *high*. This implied that teachers do not use jokes to label students on their gender which could result to teasing and shame.

Another prominent result was in statement no. 4 which states, “Students and Teachers should be aware of the Gender Sensitivity concept”. It resulted to a mean average of 1.89 which has an adjectival rating of *high*. The result indicated that teachers and students have the knowledge and are aware of the concept of gender sensitivity. Further, having this awareness, teachers become responsive to gender issues in school.

Both statements reflect extreme results, statement No. 3 being low in its weighted mean, while statement no. 4 being the highest in weighted mean. In this line, according to Lee and Carpenter (2015), both student teacher groups perceived that there is inadequacy and unpreparedness in managing the complex intricacies of sexualities on their part because they were not given enough training and understanding to deal with such cases.

The above condition of this study does not have the consideration of which is a joke or not; in addition, awareness to gender sensitivity could be vague statement because one could be less likely to be aware though they think they are. This data also highlighted that students shall not be treated for joke cracking and gender shaming. Though the entire concept of gender sensitivity is not well grounded; hence, there are certain inconsistencies. Overall, the institutions have their gender sensitivity campaigns at utmost considerations.

This showed that communication process among schools is developed for gender sensitivity. It is also interpreted that schools should have to uplift the morale of students through giving programs for the gender sensitivity and development.

Table 1.2 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Equal Treatment

Statement Number	Equality Treatment	Mean	Interpretation
6	Students should not be stereotyped on the basis of course choices	1.97	High
7	Students or Teachers should not be treated to be better at a certain field because of gender	1.91	High
8	All genders should be treated equally in a classroom	1.98	High
9	Gender identity in terms of clothing and expressions should be respected	1.97	High
10	Student organizations and activities should welcome all genders	1.98	High
Overall		1.92	High

Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)

Table 1.2 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Equal Treatment with the overall mean of 1.92 being interpreted as *high*.

The result implied that teachers practice equal treatment among their students and peers. That LGBT students were not deprived of opportunities and privileges provided to heterosexual students as well.

In this category, there was one statement which yielded the least mean of 1.91. This is found in statement No. 7, which states, “Students or Teachers should not be treated to be better at a certain field because of gender”.

This result manifests the disagreement of the teachers on the statement. They believed that their students and peers should be encouraged and motivated to pursue a field or dream regardless of their gender preference.

In one of the first studies (Murphy, 2014), they developed and tested the Student-Athlete Climate Conceptual Frame, which suggests that individual and institutional characteristics directly influence both how student-athletes experience climate and a variety of educational outcomes unique to student-athletes. This shows that there is presence of stereotypes when it comes to gender identity.

However, the teachers in this study believe that the students shall not be treated differently based on neither their gender preference nor their expressions. Abilities of their students are not being affected by their gender; instead, welcome them to the organization. Abernethy (2012) said several gay and lesbian players have succeeded in the college ranks, such as Brian Sims, co-captain of the Bloomsburg University football team, and Sarah Vaillancourt, member of Harvard's women's hockey team.

As per the concept of fair treatment, PE teachers agreed with the idea that classrooms should treat their students with gender sensitivity. Classrooms shall respect the gender expression and identities of their students especially among students themselves. Conversely, genders do not bound to which fields of sports and abilities students have.

Table 1.3 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Teaching Content

Statement Number	Content in Teaching	Mean	Interpretation
11	All genders are portrayed equally in leadership roles in the educational materials	2.00	High
12	Pictures or texts used are equally represented by all genders	1.98	High
13	All genders are equally portrayed as caring and loving in the educational materials	1.97	High
14	Being athletic should be perceived not based on gender	1.95	High
15	Dance, Sports, and Health Concepts should be sensitive to gender-equality portrayal	1.97	High
Over-all		1.97	High
Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)			

Table 1.3 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Teaching Content. It resulted to an over- all weighted mean of 1.97 which is being interpreted as *High*.

The over-all findings agreed to the statement from Murphy (2014) who emphasized that climate *such in school activities* significantly affects lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) student-athletes' academics and athletics outcomes.

The quality of learning materials being used, how they are used, and how they affect the students shows a crucial result to gender sensitivity. If the materials are showing the portrayals of genders in unequal way or the other, this would result to shaming due to inconsistencies and subjective approach. The leaning methods shall widely consider aspects that also support equality in learning and teaching.

This identifies for the gender portrayals where teachers believe that gender sensitivity shall be incorporated in their lessons and lectures. The topics, demonstrations, samples and projects are far as sensitive enough to student's gender identity, and expressions. Skills and abilities should not bound for subjectivity of genders.

Significantly, statement no 11 which states, "All genders are portrayed equally in leadership roles in the educational materials" resulted to a very high weighted mean of 2.0 among all others statements. This implied that teachers view leadership roles and other lead functions equally given to everyone in the school setting and thus giving an over-all impression that regardless of gender preferences, students are given the opportunity to lead in school activities.

Table 1.4 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on School Program for Gender Sensitivity

Statement Number	School Program for Gender Sensitivity	Mean	Interpretation
16	School should have an office for grievances for gender-based discrimination cases	1.91	High
17	There should be an office campaigning actively for gender sensitivity through training and awareness.	1.98	High
18	Gender and Development program by DepEd or CHED should be strictly implemented	1.97	High
19	There should be a culmination program for gender and development campaign	1.84	High
20	All school programs and undertakings should be gender-sensitive	1.97	High
Over-all		1.93	High
Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)			

Table 1.4 reveals that school program for gender sensitivity has the overall mean of 1.93 and was interpreted as High in awareness of PE teachers. The result implied that school programs and activities are gender sensitive and gender responsive.

In this context, teachers as well as students are encouraged to continue to be actively engaged in the concept of gender sensitivity along with the provisions developed by the education departments.

It also implied that the school programs observed strict implementation of gender equality and gender expressions. Teachers and the school administration are strong partners for gender sensitivity campaigns.

Additionally, Sharma, 2017 states schools can play an important role in inculcating gender sensitivity in etiquettes and manners of students. It is necessary to create a gender responsive school in which the academic, social and physical environment and its surrounding community take into account the specific needs of girls and boys. The policymaking, discipline and control might come to the school administration as they govern the school to be a gender-oriented institution.

Table 1.5 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Gender-Sensitive Behavior

Statement Number	Gender-Sensitive Behavior	Mean	Interpretation
21	Teachers should intervene on students who behave discriminately to other genders	1.98	High
22	Teachers should pay attention on activities when gender-based discrimination happens	1.98	High
23	Gender-based bullying inside the school premises should be addressed proactively	1.97	High
24	Exclusion to organization or similar situation without valid reasons should be dealt with seriously.	1.91	High
25	The same respectable gender-sensitive behavior should be given to teachers among themselves.	1.92	High
Over-all		1.95	High
Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)			

Table 1.5 shows Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers on Gender Sensitive Behavior. It has an overall mean of 1.95 with an adjectival description as high. The least mean comes from the unwelcoming climate by exclusion to organizations shall be treated seriously having the mean of 1.91. According to Sharma (2017), teachers can serve as role models for the students.

In this category, teachers take the responsibility in responding to the conflicts concerning gender sensitivity. Disciplinary actions have to be taken if students create or subordinate gender shaming and joke cracking affecting student's gender expression and emotions.

Furthermore, the prevention also comes from the teachers themselves. Teacher may use multiple strategies and interventions to ensure that students have equal opportunities to both create and obtain their goals. Teachers are required to be serious about the gender issue. For the teachers to bring about a change in the society they should be given pre-hand knowledge over the issue.

Research Problem 2: What is the Level of Awareness of Physical Education students on Gender Sensitivity?

Table 2.1 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Communication Process

Statement Number	Communication Process	Mean	Interpretation
1	Students should not be subjected to sexist jokes in any conversation	1.85	High
2	Sexist comments should be avoided in a conversation with students	1.80	High
3	Avoiding the use of jokes making gender-oriented labels	1.79	High
4	Students and Teachers should be aware of the Gender Sensitivity concept	1.89	High
5	Students should be informed of the school's gender and development program and policies	1.83	High
Overall		1.85	High

Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)

Table 2.1 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Communication Process which yielded an overall mean of 1.85 and interpreted as high.

In the aspect of communication, this factor seemed to be established in the schools as perceived by the students. The data yielded high awareness among students which also shows that schools developed different actions and policies to support gender sensitivity.

Similarly, according to Lee and Carpenter (2015), both student teacher groups perceived that there is inadequacy and unpreparedness in managing the complex intricacies of sexualities on their part because they were not given enough training and understanding to deal with such cases.

Intervention of school administration was observed by the students. For peer communication, the students also chose their verbal and non-verbal actions signifying gender sensitivity enough for their schoolmates. Gender-oriented school were created that allow for gender sensitivity among students especially in respecting the gender identity and expressions.

However, there were still less approaches that had been determined for gender sensitivity. For instance, avoiding the use of discriminating jokes as reflected in Statement No. 3 which states, "Avoiding the use of jokes making gender-oriented labels", could not be a gender-sensitive approach. In that sense, there is still fewer known strategies to gender sensitivity.

Table 2.2 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Equal Treatment

Statement Number	Equality Treatment	Mean	Interpretation
6	Students should not be stereotyped on the basis of course choices	1.71	High
7	Students or Teachers should not be treated to be better at a certain field because of gender	1.70	High
8	All genders should be treated equally in a classroom	1.87	High
9	Gender identity in terms of clothing and expressions should be respected	1.84	High
10	Student organizations and activities should welcome all genders	1.87	High
Overall		1.80	High

Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)

Table 3.2 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Equal Treatment. The overall mean resulted to 1.80 and interpreted as high.

As shown in the data, students believed that classroom should have to be gender-oriented by supporting stereotype-free community for students. Respect to the gender expression and emotions were also believed to be present in their classroom. In general, the gender of students was equally viewed, respected and supported down to the classroom level.

Table 2.3 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Content in Teaching

Statement Number	Content in Teaching	Mean	Interpretation
11	All genders are portrayed equally in leadership roles in the educational materials	1.85	High
12	Pictures or texts used are equally represented by all genders	1.75	High
13	All genders are equally portrayed as caring and loving in the educational materials	1.81	High
14	Being athletic should be perceived not based on gender	1.82	High
15	Dance, Sports, and Health Concepts should be sensitive to gender-equality portrayal	1.80	High
Over-all		1.83	High

Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)

In terms on the level of awareness on teaching content, Table 2.3 revealed that it yielded a 1.83 over-all mean average with an adjectival rating as *high*.

This means that in terms of teaching content, students view the teaching as well as the instructional materials to be gender related and gender sensitive.

The findings offered that climate significantly affects lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and queer (LGBTQ) student-athletes' academics and athletics outcomes. LGBTQ student-athletes for instance, generally have that experience and perceived a more negative climate than their heterosexual peers. These negative experiences with climate adversely influence their athletics identities and reports of academic success.

Although sexual identity is not a direct predictor of academic success or athletics identity, the way LGBTQ student-athletes experience the climate significantly influences both. Lectures, lessons and the materials in use for learning are considered to be gender sensitive for student.

Portrayals, demonstrations, expressions and activities are pro-gender and are also developed to support gender sensitivity among students. Learning materials used for their lessons are given to be contents for gender developments. Equality of gender as shown by the learning materials (learning climate) in their lessons as the teachers tries to be gender sensitive enough to them.

The message of the learning materials shall not be subjective to the gender identity of one person; it must follow respect and does not represent the entire third-gender community.

Table 2.4 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on School Program for Gender Sensitivity

Statement Number	School Program for Gender Sensitivity	Mean	Interpretation
16	School should have an office for grievances for gender-based discrimination cases	1.91	High
17	There should be an office campaigning actively for gender sensitivity through training and awareness.	1.98	High
18	Gender and Development program by DepEd or CHED should be strictly implemented	1.97	High
19	There should be a culmination program for gender and development campaign	1.84	High

20	All school programs and undertakings should be gender-sensitive	1.97	High
Over-all		1.93	High
Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)			

Table 2.4 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on School program for gender sensitivity. It has the overall mean of 1.93 and with an adjectival rating as *high*.

Rankin (2017) said historically, athletics programs on college or university campuses might be sources of specific concerns for queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum students. In this context, the administration must think of policies that widely cover the gender equality in their institution.

The school must secure the policies are realistic and do not highlight the presence of gender insensitivity nor intensifying the problem. It is possible that the policies might also affect the gender sensitivity of students. Because the school does follow their programs to gender sensitivity, it is significant to students as they also support their schools to their campaigns.

Learners are aware of the gender developments made by the school administration. They also observe that schools do plan and implement programs and activities that focuses on how to create a school free from gender shaming, through developing policies, programs, and other approaches in supporting gender expression and identity.

Creating governing bodies that concerns to gender equality and respect was felt and welcomed by the students on the concept of fair and equal treatment among students.

Table 2.5 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Gender-Sensitive Behavior

Statement Number	Gender-Sensitive Behavior	Mean	Interpretation
21	Teachers should intervene on students who behave discriminately to other genders	1.84	High
22	Teachers should pay attention on activities when gender-based discrimination happens	1.80	High
23	Gender-based bullying inside the school premises should be addressed proactively	1.87	High
24	Exclusion to organization or similar situation without valid reasons should be dealt with seriously.	1.79	High
25	The same respectable gender-sensitive behavior should be given to teachers among themselves.	1.70	High
Over-all		1.82	High

Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)

Table 2.5 shows the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Gender-Sensitive Behavior with an overall mean of 1.82 and interpreted as *high*.

The result is deemed similar and agrees to the study of McCune (1974) who found that sexual-minority college students were more likely to experience and witness incivility (disrespectful behaviors) and hostility (overt violence), and personal incivility and witnessing hostility were associated with greater odds of problematic drinking.

Discrimination at the individual level (hostility, harassment, bullying and physical violence) and institutional level (laws and public policies) have been identified as risk factors for depression, social isolation and hopelessness, which in turn place LGBTQ people at risk. The responsibility of discipline and control for gender shaming and joke cracking affecting the gender sensitivity is given to the teachers according to the students.

It is also described that students choose teachers as the main people to be supportive enough in providing a gender-oriented school for them. Teachers have to pay attentions to the actions and expressions of students that mainly target the emotions of students to gender

identity. Serious approach shall also be given priority by the administration to be a gender sensitive and gender-oriented institution.

Table 3.6 Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on Perception to Gender Sensitivity

Statement Number	Perception to Gender Sensitivity	Mean	Interpretation
26	Gender sensitivity concepts are not applicable to all genders	1.66	Neutral
27	Gender sensitivity concept is against gender and development programs	1.58	Neutral
28	Gender jokes are funny and will not hurt the labeled gender.	1.52	Neutral
29	It is okay if males are assumed to be better leaders	1.56	Neutral
30	Women and the LGBT are expected to be weaker in sports	1.47	Neutral
Over-all		1.55	Neutral

Legend: Low (1-1.33), Neutral (1.34-1.66), High (1.67-2.00)

Table 3.6 presents the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Students on their perceptions towards gender sensitivity. The over-all mean resulted to 1.53 with an adjectival rating as *neutral*.

This result is comparable to what Weber (2018) said that many of the experiences of LGBTQ student- athletes are similar to the general population; that, there are several ways in which their lives are very different from their heterosexual peers. Overall, “in-house” harassment or harassment experienced at practice or similar athletics-related events, whether intentional or not, is the most prevalent kind experienced by our respondents.

The result also implies that it is possible that gender sensitivity does not pose any boundary of which is discriminating and which is not, yielding to neutral responses. Though the gender sensitive approaches are present and slowly introduced in all schools, some students believed that gender sensitivity could not be completely established as there are some gray areas that need to be established

Still, some believed that some jokes were funny but do not affect the gender expression of students. Equality of gender towards activities like sports is unclear because students think that men are better in activities that requires physical strength. They also neutrally think that gender sensitivity is nevertheless against gender development.

Research Problem 3: Is there a significant association to the level of awareness between the PE teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity?

This analysis sought for the possible connections to the awareness level of PE teachers and students. This collected data from students and teachers giving off associations in different categories. The level of significance is at less than 0.05.

Table 4.1 Correlation Under Communication Process Category

Category	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
Communication Process	-0.027	0.83	Insignificant

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

Table 3.1 shows there was no significant association between PE teachers and students having the significance level of 0.8. Coefficient shows that the data from survey taken only by

chance and has also weak association. The relationship of awareness level is not associable to the quality of awareness the other have.

This also showed that teachers and students, in comparison to their communications, one could be independent of having the self-approach in respecting genders and identity through communicating humanely.

Communication Process mainly covers the actions and verbal expressions of students and teachers that support the gender sensitivity in their schools. It is described that communication process is highly established in schools; hence, associations quantify certain relationships in between the two groups. In contrast to the American setting where the verbal discrimination is high, 92% of LGBT students had been harassed verbally by jokes and gender shaming. Additionally, the report of less “school belonging” in relation to their heterosexual counterparts which could contribute to lower levels of well-being (Heck, N. C. et. al., 2014).

In this sense, this research found out that in the Philippine schools, the heterosexual students and teachers are at utmost welcome to LGBT students whom they treat equally as themselves. Heterosexual students and teachers seem to be not “homophobic” but supportive to them. Gender-Straight Alliance [GSA] may help students to distinguish safe and accepting school personnel and attitudes of school personnel are an essential part for school climate and gender sensitivity (Heck, N. C. et. al., 2014).

Table 3.2 Correlation Under Equal Treatment Category

Category	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
Equality Treatment	-0.016	0.90	Insignificant

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

In Table 3.2, the Equal treatment shows no significant association between the respondents. The significance level is at 0.9 while the coefficient is -0.016. This points out that fair treatment from the teachers is not associable to the students.

In this context, both groups have their own ideas on how to fairly treat other students with gender sensitivity. No association means that every respondent differs with their awareness as well as how they interact with varying gender identity in their classrooms.

LGBT high school students from the United States indicate that approximately 21% of LGBT students report having been physically assaulted at school as compared to heterosexuals (Heck, N. C. et. al., 2014). LGBT students declare to have experiences of discrimination because of their sexual orientation or gender identity; it is 86% in Estonia, 84% in Belgium, 73% in Italy. The Italian data show that in general transgender persons, gay and bisexual men are more often victims of discriminations than lesbian and bisexual women (Dankmeijer, P. et. al., 2014). As shown in the data for this study, there is no significant association to the students’ perspectives to the teachers’. It is important to think that they believe, there is equality given to the LGBT students in treating them for activities and education. In contrast to the foreign studies, the population had been treated the homosexual students as what they have to be. Though there is still presence of discrimination either intentional or not, the current school climate is somehow favorable for them.

Table 3.3 Correlation under Content Teaching Category

Category	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
Content Teaching	0.044	0.73	Insignificant

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

Table 3.3 reveals that similar to the category of Content in teaching on the other hand, does not have any association comparing the responses from students and teachers.

The significance is at 0.73 and coefficient is 0.04. The data was taken by chance and less likely to be associable to the other group. The content in teaching is viewed to be different between the groups. They give biases to gender sensitivity by and only among themselves.

Contents in teaching also showed that the perspective of teachers does not affect the perspective on the students as per category itself.

Table 3.4 Correlation under School Programs Category

Category	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
School Programs	-0.134	0.29	Insignificant

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

School programs in the Table 3.4 yielded significance level of 0.29 and having the coefficient -0.134. this means that there was no significant association between the level of awareness of PE teachers and students towards gender sensitivity in comparison to School programs.

Teachers have their perspective different from students; and there are no direct connections that their perspective affects the student's. As a result, the school programs are believed to have possible effects in gender sensitivity campaigns though these affects are viewed by the respondents differently and independently.

Having an inclusive anti-discrimination guideline, all-encompassing of sexual orientation and gender identity respect, and essential to maximize school security of all LGBT students. (Heck, N. C. et. al., 2014). LGBT students attend schools without gender sensitivity policies were "more likely to skip school due to fears surrounding their safety." Moreover, only 18.2% of respondents in their study reported attending to a school with a comprehensive policy, while only 6.8% reported the policies include both sexual orientation and gender identity and expression.

Simply, complete enforcement of a policy value the gender diversity within a school (Heck, N. C. et. al., 2014). In this study, teachers and students believe that the policies are enough to be sensitive institution. They consider the policies and guidelines as the modality to uplift the gender sensitivity among them. Similar to Heck, N. C. et. al., (2014), they also believe that the policies are great aspects in order to protect the LGBT students from discrimination and gender shaming. With that, this study agrees with Adelman, M., & Lugg, C. A. (2012) that comprehensive anti-bullying policies is evaluated as the most effective type of anti-bullying policy.

Table 3.5 Correlation Under Gender Sensitive Category

Category	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
Gender Sensitive Behaviors	-0.192	0.13	Insignificant

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

Gender sensitive behavior, as tabulated in Table 4.5, showed no association with the level of significance at 0.13 and coefficient of -0.19. This result proves that the behaviors of teachers in gender sensitivity do not affect those of students.

Gender sensitivity among them has different perspectives and is less likely to be associable to the other. This also gives the fact that students do not follow what the teachers show to them; but they treat their classmates with enough sensitivity in different ways. Alexander (2008) described there is a need for faculty to tackle gender intolerance, support marginalized students, and apply policies and institutional guidelines that protect LGBT individuals. LGBT students often portray safety issues regarding their sexual and gender identity. Gay and transgender youth, frequently experience harassment, bullying, and violence during their middle school and high school years.

Students sought to talk about objective security in the classroom and beyond, particularly how classroom discussions follow students outside their classroom Furrow, H. (2012). In this study, however, the respondents highly support them in the way they are not having that perspective of "discrimination." In fact, both of the teachers and students welcome them into their classrooms as individuals with essence. Against the claim of Kitchen, J., & Bellini, C. (2012) that teachers repeatedly show to be bystanders mutely abetting the

homophobic bullying pervades at secondary schools. Teachers, in this study, have the great coverage for gender sensitivity and thus, they view themselves as the person to lead gender respect in their school. Though at the very least, both students and teachers are sensitive to their colleagues.

Table 3.6 Correlation under the Perception

Category	Correlation Coefficient	Significance	Interpretation
Perception	0.084	0.51	Insignificant

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

Table 3.6 shows the correlation of under the perception category. This implies that the perceptions of teachers do not affect the student's perception towards gender sensitivity. It yielded a significance level at 0.51 and coefficient of 0.08.

The data showed that perceptions are not associable to the other. The respondents think differently in comparison to their ideas of gender sensitivity. There was no association and effects on the potential difference of their perspectives as they interact with different genders among their colleagues. As what Kitchen and Bellini (2012) argue, "educators can make a positive difference, but only if they take the initiative to address the problem."

The actions of teachers and administrators decide the achievement of anti-bullying initiatives and the climate should be getting better for students. But still, homophobia and homophobic harassment remain continual issues in most schools. As also suggested in this study, both students and teachers have that "neutral" perception about gender equality; they could barely think of how do gender sensitivity approaches work. These could be either achieve or not depending on how they are delivered and executed.

Similar to the claims of Kitchen and Bellini (2012), the respondents also believe that the administration has the great responsibility for gender sensitivity campaigns. Teachers could not affect their students' process on how they treat their classmates as LGBT members; conversely, they have different perceptions about the gender sensitivity but the central perspective is to be equal in providing good climate to them.

Research Problem 4: Is there a significant difference in the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity when data are classified according to age and gender?

Table 4.1 Significant Difference in the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity when data are classified according to Age

Categories	Residuals	Sum of Squares	F	Sig.	Interpretation
Communication	Between Groups	0.205	3.139	0.045*	Significant
	Within Groups	8.540			
	Total	8.745			
Equality	Between Groups	0.024	0.335	0.716	Not Significant
	Within Groups	9.546			
	Total	9.570			
Content	Between Groups	0.064	0.776	0.461	Not Significant
	Within Groups	10.829			
	Total	10.893			
School Program	Between Groups	0.079	0.792	0.454	Not Significant
	Within Groups	13.066			
	Total	13.145			
Gender Sensitive	Between Groups	0.167	1.982	0.140	Not Significant
	Within Groups	10.968			

	Total	11.135			
	Between Groups	1.524	5.210	0.006*	
Perception	Within Groups	38.177			Significant
	Total	39.701			

In Table 4.1, it is shown that there was a significant difference in the level of awareness of respondents grouped by ages. The p-value was at 0.045. This means that the communication process was well established in the schools as per the level of awareness of students and teachers towards gender sensitivity.

They mostly observed good communications in interacting to other people while avoiding verbal and non-verbal actions that target the gender expression and identity. At least one group thinks that communication process is a freeway and systemic approach for achieving a gender-oriented institution.

In contrast, Lee and Carpenter (2015) found that practicum settings are heteronormative and showed that LGBTI student teachers perceived to be doubtful of their security. In the setting, students and teachers are sensitive enough which nothing to be worried about.

Equality Treatment, as presented in the Table 5.1, shows that there is no significant difference in the level of awareness as grouped by ages. The p-value was 0.7. This data highlights a concept of which students and teachers equally treat the students concerning about gender identity. The fact also depicted where students viewed fair treatment just like how their teachers do. The data is entirely mannered to show least possible difference in the level of awareness in students and teachers.

The contents in teaching yielded a not significant result with the p-value of 0.45. As interpreted in this study, students and teachers prefer that the materials in use in their lectures are gender sensitive enough for non-binary genders. The respondents equally think that this is an important category for the gender sensitivity campaigns in their schools.

It is quite observable where teachers and students believe about how does the lecturing and lessons with gender sensitive contents are shown to be independent category of gender awareness, development and orientations. Studies argued that, Academic contents with lessons on gender sensitivity and moral traditions will unconsciously mold the character of the tender mind.

For the School programs, Table 5.1 further revealed that there was no significant difference between the age brackets with the level of significance at 0.46. Respondents, regardless of their ages, have their level of awareness equally compared to others. Their perspectives towards the quality of delivering campaigns for gender sensitivity are well fixed and seemingly comparable to other group ages. Their equal awareness shows that age is not a factor for gender sensitivity awareness. Similarly, teacher's role in student's life in school is to ensure that each of its students have equal opportunities to both create and obtain their goals regardless of their sexual orientations (UNDP, USAID 2014).

Moving further, Table 5.1 further showed that there was no significant difference in the gender sensitivity behaviors in terms of age group. This suggests that ages are not a factor for change in awareness and perspectives towards the disciplines and actions to be taken for gender shaming. Thus, it also showed that all respondents believed on the importance of imposing policies and actions in order to support gender sensitivity and control discrimination in gender identity.

Aksornkool (2004) believed that gender sensitivity is not about pitting women against men. Hence, it is about changing behavior and instilling empathy into the views that we hold about our own and the other genders. The gender sensitivity issues are totally about the behavior they do and not on how they view. This would include how they interact, how welcoming they are and their ability to understand differences. The respondents believe that the behaviors are important aspect in order to be gender sensitive.

A perception in Gender sensitivity, as presented in the Table 5.1 where it identified different concerns with the significance level of 0.006. The fact showing respondents negatively believed about the misleading gender sensitivity and awareness. They also thought of the idea that age was a factor of how does the people view gender sensitivity as less priority. In a flipside, the data determined the confidence of achieving a gender-oriented institution is having less confidence. Similarly, according to Lee and Carpenter (2015), it was noted that educators are faced with complex challenges in promoting balance outcomes in education.

Overall, in contrast to the claims of Rankin (2017) where they argue that most of the students as well as the instructors tend to be homosexist and homophobic towards non-binary genders, in this study, it showed to be them less likely to be neither skeptical nor discriminative as they interact with them. It is also noted that they view than as part of the group and they do not treat them the way of Rankin (2017) study showed beforehand.

Maybe this is shown that with the proper guidance and effective communication, the concept of being gender-oriented classrooms will be achieved if the school climate is welcoming to the skills and abilities of LGBTQI+ members especially in athletics and sports. School climate believes that the gender could not define one's gender roles as long as the administration executes exemplary policies and campaigns.

Table 4.2 Significant Difference in the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity when data are classified according to Gender

Category	Gender	Frequency	Mean	p-value	Interpretation
Communication Process	Female	125	1.9136	0.00*	Significant
	Male	116	1.8552		
Equality Treatment	Female	125	1.8544	0.24	Not Significant
	Male	116	1.8517		
Content Teaching	Female	125	1.8800	0.21	Not Significant
	Male	116	1.8483		
School Programs	Female	125	1.8272	0.28	Not Significant
	Male	116	1.8241		
Gender Sensitive Behaviors	Female	125	1.8624	0.860	Not Significant
	Male	116	1.8328		
Perception	Female	125	1.4656	0.018*	Significant
	Male	116	1.5828		

Note: p-value is significant if less than 0.05 (<0.05) being denoted by *

Table 4.2 shows the Significant Difference in the Level of Awareness of Physical Education Teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity when data are classified according to *Gender*.

Among all categories, the area on “communication process” yielded a p-value of 0.00 and implied to have significant difference. This means that the process of supporting gender development and respect to identity is much given priority by the female teachers and students. This also means that female respondents are aware of their interactions most importantly among LGBTQI+ members. In that context, females are most likely to be sensitive of their verbal communication to the LGBT students.

They are significantly choosing their words and expression which they create the sense of understanding and belonging to the homosexuals. Weber (2018) said there are several ways in which their lives are very different from their heterosexual peers.

Overall, in-house harassment (e.g., classrooms), or harassment experienced at practice or similar athletics-related events, whether intentional or not, is the most prevalent kind

experienced by our respondents. Cracking jokes (either intentional to bullying or not) and gender shaming are controlled mostly by women.

Proper expression of respect in verbal interactions according to them, is the ways of creating a gender sensitive school. Conversely, females are most likely conservative of their verbal actions than males.

As shown in Table 4.2, there was no significant difference for equality in treatment as grouped by gender and has the p-value of 0.24. This means, the gender could not be factor in the difference of treatment to non-binary genders. This also suggests that the respondents (except those of LGBTQI+ members) had equally treated their colleagues regardless of their gender identity.

This is a positive aspect where everyone is sensitive enough to the gender identity without creating conflicts concerning the equality and respects to one's gender expression. Students and teachers view their non-binary colleagues with positivity and optimism to their skills.

In that sense, Abernethy (2012) said several gay and lesbian players have succeeded in the college ranks, such as Brian Sims, co-captain of the Bloomsburg University football team, and Sarah Vaillancourt, member of Harvard's women's hockey team. This shows that the teachers and students believe that the skills do not follow one's gender identity.

Table 4.2 further revealed that there was no significant difference (p-value = 0.21) on the gender as per the content of teaching is concerned. This means, both of the genders are aware of how do different methods of teaching e.g., multimedia, demonstrations and samples could be an effective way to develop gender-oriented institutions. It is also described that content in teaching is less likely to be different of usage as the students and teachers use them for their lessons. They equally view that the contents in teaching should be sensitive enough to the gender identity of the students.

Also revealed in Table 4.2, that there was no significant difference in the school programs for gender sensitivity having the p-value of 0.28. The result suggests that genders are not attributable to the awareness of school programs for sensitivity.

All genders believe that the gender sensitivity campaigns are most likely be given to the school administration. The campaigns should be based on the provisions of the education sectors and is also aware of the necessary actions be taken for maximizing the quality of policies being implemented.

Unlike the claims of Rankin (2017), historically, athletics programs on college or university campuses might be sources of specific concerns for queer-spectrum and trans-spectrum students. In this study, there are less likely negative effects on the incorporation of sensitivity to policies and guidelines.

The same table showed that there was no significant difference in gender sensitive behavior of both male and female respondents and the p-value is 0.86. This means, the binary genders are not a factor for the difference in behaviors of the students and teachers. They believed that treatments and policies shall be taken effectively for discipline and supporting gender development and respect. This also suggested that both genders were aware of how do discipline would take effect in controlling possible conflicts in gender sensitivity.

At the same time, as mentioned by Murphy (2014), student-athletes' experiences of climate can also influence their educational outcomes. This shall follow a proactive discipline to discrimination and bullying just like how the student does and teachers believe.

With regards to Table 4.2, the results suggest that there was significant difference in the perceptions of respondents to gender sensitivity as grouped by gender having the p-value of 0.018. This suggests that females are mostly to be pessimistic of achieving gender equality and development.

They most likely think of different circumstances that they could face as they further support gender sensitivity. They also face some difficulties in achieving well gender orientations among themselves and others. They could have conflicts than of the men.

Overall, in contrast to Roper (2007) where males are most likely to be skeptical and discriminative towards homosexuals, it is described in this study that neither male nor the female. It is also suggested that the males are possibly showing more respect and are also having positive perspectives to non-binary students. The idea is also showing that the climate among schools concerning the gender equality and roles does not have great issues that widely affect the performances of LGBTQI+ students.

Conclusion

As revealed in this study, gender was a factor for Communication process and difference in Perception. It has been described that the Communication process mostly being considered by the female as important component for gender sensitivity; where there is also a possibility for male to be discriminative about gender orientation. Gender also influenced the perception of the respondents where males were more pessimistic in achieving gender sensitive institution. Another factor that affects the Communication Process where different ages were shown to be onwards for gender-sensitive classrooms. Age brackets believed that the students and teachers have to be supportive for gender identity of an individual as they prefer a certain sport or activity. They believe this will not limit their capacity to be an athlete. However, the age brackets is also unsure if the institution will achieve a gender-sensitive setting because they believe there is still present discrimination to LGBT community. Perceptions were neutral and thus, there is occurrence of harm, bullying, and discrimination.

This study concluded that the level of awareness of PE Teachers and students on Gender Sensitivity revealed to be neutral. Through the awareness level that were determined on the following factors such as (a) Communication Process, (b) Equal Treatment, (c) Teaching Content, (d) School Program on Gender Sensitivity and (e) Sender Sensitive Behavior yielded high results.

Gender Sensitivity among students and teachers in both districts were not fully established though not necessarily considered of discrimination, as there were significant efforts on the part of Administration and School Officials to make the schools in both districts to be gender sensitive and gender responsive.

References

- Abernethy, M. (2012). The Stigma of the LGBT Athlete. www.popmatters.com
- Aksornkool, N. (2004). Gender sensitivity: a training manual for sensitizing education managers, curriculum and material developers and media professionals to gender concerns. p. 201.
- Akash, 2018 <https://digitallearning.eletsonline.com/2018/06/importance-of-nurturing-gender-sensitivity-through-education/>
- Braun, L., Hunter, J., Rosario, M.; Schrimshaw, E. W. (2006). Sexual identity development among lesbian, gay, and bisexual youths: Consistency and change over time". *The Journal of Sex Research*, 43, (1), 8-17.
- Department of Education (2016). K to 12 Physical Education Curriculum Guide.
- Dowling, E. M., Getsdottir, S., Anderson, P. M., von Eye, A., Almerigi, J. & Lerner, R.M. (2004). Structural relations among spirituality, religiosity, and thriving in adolescence. *Applied Developmental Science*, 8, 7-16.
- Chavez JV and Prado RTD (2023) Discourse analysis on online gender-based humor: Markers of normalization, tolerance, and lens of inequality. *Forum for Linguistic Studies* 5(1): 55–71. DOI: 10.18063/fls.v5i1.1530.
- Chavez, J.V., Lamorinas, D.D., and Ceneciro, C.C. (2023). Message patterns of online gender-based humor, discriminatory practices, biases, stereotyping, and disempowering tools

- through discourse analysis. *Forum for Linguistic Studies* 2023; 5(2): 1535. <http://doi.org/10.59400.fl.s.v5i2.1535>.
- Chavez JV, Del Prado R, Estoque M (2023). Disrupted income of women educators during pandemic: Economic effects, adaptive strategies, and government recovery initiatives. *Journal of Infrastructure, Policy and Development* 7(2): 1973. doi: 10.24294/jipd.v7i2.1973.
- Chavez JV, Gregorio MW, Araneta AL, Bihag CD. (2024). Magna carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace: Policy awareness and organizational compliance. *Environment and Social Psychology* 2024; 9(1): 1735. doi: 10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735
- Chavez JV, Cuilan JT. (2024). Gender mainstreaming campaign as a casualty of the online gender-based humor: A discourse analysis. *Environment and Social Psychology* 2024; 9(2): 2044. doi: 10.54517/esp.v9i2.2044
- Eagly, A. & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behaviour: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist* 54 (6), 408–423. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.54.6.408.
- Education Bug (2015). *Secular vs. sectarian schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.educationbug.org/a/secular-vs--sectarian-schools.html>
- European Institute for Gender Equality (2019). <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/methods-tools/gender-awareness-raising>
- Foucault, M. 1980. *The History of Sexuality Volume I*. New York: Vintage. <https://eige.europa.eu/gender-mainstreaming/methods-tools/gender-awareness-raising>
- Galacio, G. T. (2007). *Department of education regulations on the teaching of religion in public schools*. Retrieved from <http://bbcstamesa.blogspot/2007/12/departement-of-education-regulations-on.html>
- Green, A. I. (2007). Queer theory and sociology: Locating the subject and the self in sexuality studies. *Sociological Theory*, 25(1), 26-45.
- Lee, D. & Carpenter, V. (2014). “What would you like me to do? Lie to you?” Teacher education responsibilities to LGBTI students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 43 (2), 169-180, DOI: 10.1080/1359866X.2014.932331.
- Lovaas, K. & Mercilee M. J (2006). Charting a path through the desert of nothing. In K. Lovaas & M. Mercilee (Eds.), *Sexualities and communication in everyday life: A reader*, (pp.8-16). N.Y.USA: Sage Publications Inc. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288240250_Physical_education_and_female_participation_A_case_study_of_teachers'_perspectives_and_strategies
- Melton, E. N., & Cunningham, G. B. (2014). Examining the workplace experiences of sport employees who are LGBT: A social categorization theory perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 28(1), 21-33.
- McCune, S. Vocational education: A dual system: Inequality in Education. National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Washington, D.C., March 1974, 28-34.
- Murphy, Dionigi & Litchfield, 2014. Physical Education and Female Participation. A Case Study.
- Oakes, P. J. (1987). The salience of social categories. In J.C. Turner, M.A. Hogg, P.J. Oakes, S.D. Reicher, & M.S. Wetherell (Eds.), *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory* (p. 117–141). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Rankin, S. & Genevieve, C. (2017). *Mind Body And Sport Harassment And Discrimination Lgbtq Student Athletes*
- Reetika Sharma [http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v6\(6\)/Version-4/G0606043840.pdf](http://www.ijhssi.org/papers/v6(6)/Version-4/G0606043840.pdf)

- Šribar, R. (2015), 'Glossary of common terms in gender equality and feminist theory', in M. Ule, R. Šribar and A. U. Venturini, eds., *Gendering Science: Slovenian Surveys and Studies in the EU Paradigms*, Vienna, Echoraum.
- Stewart, A. & McDermott, C. (2004). Gender in Psychology. *Gender in Psychology* 55, 519–544.
- Surtees, N. (2003). Lesbian and gay students: *Are teacher education programmes meeting their needs?* (Unpublished Report). Christchurch: School of Early Childhood Teacher Education.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worshel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (p. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reichter, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- UNDP, USAID (2014). *Being LGBT in Asia: The Philippines Country Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1861/2014%20UNDPUSAID%20Philippines%20LGBT%20Country%20Report%20-%20FINAL.pdf>