

Faculty and Students' Perception about Gender-Responsive Pedagogy in Isabela State University, Philippines

Marina W. Dacaca-Acerit

Isabela State University-Echague Campus, College of Education, Isabela, Philippines
E-mail: marinaacerit.isu@gmail.com

KEYWORDS Curriculum Development. Educational Inclusion. Equity Awareness. Instructional Strategies. Teacher Preparedness. Workplace Diversity

ABSTRACT Gender-responsive education is essential to advancing inclusive and equitable higher education. This study examined faculty engagement in gender-sensitive teaching at Isabela State University and identified inputs for strengthening its gender-responsive pedagogy framework. An explanatory mixed-methods design was employed involving 270 faculty members and 1,841 students during the second semester of Academic Year 2023-2024. Quantitative data were collected using an adapted Gender-Sensitivity Teaching Test and analysed using descriptive statistics and independent-samples t-tests, while qualitative responses were analysed thematically. Both faculty members and students reported very frequent engagement in gender-sensitive teaching practices, with gender equality receiving the highest ratings. Significant differences were observed across several indicators of teaching practices and gender equality. Qualitative findings revealed inconsistencies in language use, tensions between personal beliefs and professional responsibilities, gaps between awareness and practice, challenges in promoting participation, and social-emotional demands. The findings highlight the need for sustained professional development, curriculum integration, systematic feedback, and institutional mechanisms to strengthen consistent, equitable, and gender-responsive pedagogy across university classrooms.

INTRODUCTION

Gender-responsive education has become increasingly important in efforts to achieve equitable and inclusive learning environments. Education does not operate independently of social and cultural structures. Rather, classroom practices, curriculum content, teacher expectations, and student interactions may reproduce or challenge existing gender inequalities. Consequently, gender-responsive pedagogy requires educators to examine how gender influences participation, learning opportunities, classroom relationships, and academic experiences (Jabbar et al. 2025; Nguru 2023). Higher education institutions are therefore expected to move beyond formal commitments to gender equality and ensure that such commitments are reflected in everyday teaching practices.

Faculty members occupy a critical position in this process because their values, attitudes, instructional decisions, and interactions directly shape the learning environment. Teachers who perceive themselves as fair and inclusive may still unintentionally reinforce gender biases through language, classroom participation patterns, learning materials, assessment practices, and behavioural expectations. Halkiyo et al. (2023) and Mukagiahana et al. (2024) observed that pedagogical inequities may persist

even when educators demonstrate awareness of gender equality. Thus, awareness alone does not guarantee gender-responsive practice. Faculty members must possess the pedagogical competence to recognise gender dynamics and deliberately modify teaching practices in response to diverse learner experiences.

Gender-responsive pedagogy involves the intentional use of teaching approaches that promote equitable participation, challenge stereotypes, and create respectful learning spaces. It includes the use of gender-sensitive language, inclusive instructional materials, equitable classroom interactions, unbiased assessment, and teaching strategies that recognise differences in students' social and learning experiences. Kihwele et al. (2025) and Merma-Molina et al. (2024) emphasised the integration of gender dimensions into course content, learning resources, and classroom activities. Similarly, gender-responsive pedagogy frameworks stress that teaching practices must provide meaningful opportunities for all learners to participate and develop regardless of gender.

Studies in higher education demonstrate, however, that the implementation of gender-responsive pedagogy remains uneven. Nkosi and Maphalala (2025) and Rosa and Clavero (2022) identified continuing gender-based pedagogical inequities in

higher education despite institutional efforts toward equality. Makamure (2025) similarly reported that limited training, institutional constraints, and prevailing cultural norms affect educators' ability to implement gender-responsive practices. Khalil et al. (2024) and Miralles-Cardona (2025) found that gender equality content may be present in teacher education programs while deeper concepts and interactive gender-responsive pedagogies remain insufficiently integrated. These findings point to a persistent gap between institutional intentions, teacher awareness, and actual classroom implementation.

Faculty engagement is therefore fundamental to the sustainability of gender-responsive pedagogy. Engagement extends beyond acknowledging gender equality as an institutional value. It requires faculty members to reflect on their practices, modify instructional approaches, use inclusive learning resources, and respond appropriately to gender-related concerns in the classroom. Pedrajas and Jalandoni (2023) and Walsh et al. (2025) emphasised that gender-equitable practices may be weakened as principles move from institutional or teacher-education frameworks into actual teaching. Continuous faculty development and systematic monitoring are consequently necessary to ensure that gender-responsive principles are translated into observable pedagogical behaviour.

Institutional support is equally important. Sustainable gender-responsive pedagogy requires alignment among policy, curriculum, faculty development, classroom practice, and evaluation. Bastida et al. (2025) and Naciti et al. (2024) argued that gender-responsive teaching in higher education must be supported by institutional frameworks that provide educators with practical strategies and organisational direction. Without structured professional development and monitoring mechanisms, gender-sensitive practices may remain dependent on individual faculty initiative and may therefore vary considerably across classrooms.

Isabela State University, as a higher education institution committed to gender and development initiatives, recognises the importance of fostering an inclusive and equitable educational environment. Its institutional commitment to gender equality is also aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, particularly SDG 4 on quality education, SDG 5 on gender equality, and SDG 10 on reduced inequalities. However, strengthening institutional gender-responsive pedagogy requires

empirical evidence regarding how faculty members actually engage in gender-sensitive teaching and how these practices are experienced by students.

Although studies on gender-responsive pedagogy have expanded, research examining faculty self-assessment alongside student observation remains limited, particularly in Philippine higher education. The difference between how educators perceive their practices and how students experience those practices is important because gender responsiveness is ultimately manifested through observable classroom interactions. Assessing both perspectives may identify areas of alignment as well as practices that require further institutional attention.

Therefore, this study examined faculty engagement in gender-sensitive teaching at Isabela State University. By comparing faculty self-assessments with students' observations and examining emerging issues and challenges, the study provides empirical inputs for strengthening the University's gender-responsive pedagogy framework. The findings may contribute to the development of professional development programs, curriculum initiatives, monitoring mechanisms, and institutional policies that support more consistent gender-responsive teaching.

Objectives of the Study

This study generally aimed to assess the gender-sensitive teaching engagement of faculty members as a basis for enhancing the gender-responsive pedagogy framework at Isabela State University. Specifically, the study aimed to:

1. Determine the extent of faculty engagement in gender-sensitive teaching practices, based on faculty self-assessment and students' observations, in terms of values and attitudes, teaching practices and strategies, and gender equality.
2. Examine whether significant differences exist between faculty self-assessments and students' observations of gender-sensitive teaching engagement.
3. Determine the emerging issues and challenges identified by faculty and students regarding gender-sensitive teaching practices as inputs for an institutionalised gender-responsive pedagogy framework.

MATERIALS AND METHOD

The study employed an explanatory mixed-method research design to examine faculty engagement

in gender-sensitive teaching from both faculty and student perspectives. The quantitative component used a descriptive survey design to determine the extent to which faculty members engaged in gender-sensitive teaching practices and to compare faculty self-assessments with students' observations. The qualitative component complemented the quantitative findings by examining faculty and student perspectives regarding the issues, experiences, and challenges associated with gender-sensitive teaching.

The participants consisted of 270 faculty members of Isabela State University who were actively engaged in teaching and 1,841 students enrolled in their classes. Faculty members assessed their own gender-sensitive teaching practices, while students evaluated the practices they observed and experienced in their learning environments. Data collection was conducted during the second semester of Academic Year 2023-2024.

The study adapted the Gender-Sensitivity Teaching Test developed by Enoc et al. (2019). The instrument assessed gender-sensitive teaching across three dimensions, namely, teachers' values and attitudes, teaching practices and strategies, and commitment to gender equality. It was considered suitable for the present sample because it was developed within the Philippine educational context, with indicators covering instructional methods, learning materials, classroom interaction, assessment, and practices that promoted gender equality. Its validity was established through expert validation, confirming the alignment of the indicators with the intended construct, while its reliability was established through a pilot study that demonstrated satisfactory internal consistency.

Means were computed to determine the extent of faculty engagement in gender-sensitive teaching based on faculty self-assessments and students' observations. The analysis covered values and at-

titudes, teaching practices and strategies, and gender equality. The t-test was applied to determine whether significant differences existed between faculty self-assessments and students' observations. Qualitative responses obtained through open-ended written interviews were analysed thematically. Recurring ideas were coded, grouped, and organised into themes representing the emerging issues and challenges encountered in the implementation of gender-sensitive teaching.

RESULTS

Faculty Engagement in Gender-Sensitive Teaching

The extent of faculty engagement in gender-sensitive teaching based on student and faculty assessments is presented in Table 1. Students reported an overall mean of 4.32, while faculty members reported a higher mean of 4.43, with both interpreted as 'Very Often'. The high ratings across all three dimensions indicate that gender-sensitive teaching practices were generally evident. However, the consistently higher faculty self-assessments suggest that faculty members tended to perceive their implementation more positively than did their students.

Among the three dimensions, gender equality received the highest ratings, with means of 4.39 from students and 4.62 from faculty members. This indicates consistent promotion of equal treatment, equitable participation, unbiased expectations, and supportive classroom environments. The highest-rated indicator was the acceptance and treatment of students without gender bias, with means of 4.44 and 4.67, respectively. Values and attitudes obtained means of 4.28 and 4.34, while teaching practices and strategies received 4.31 and 4.39 from students and faculty, respectively.

Table 1: Students' and faculty assessments of engagement in gender-sensitive teaching

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Students' assessment mean</i>	<i>Qualitative description</i>	<i>Faculty self-assessment mean</i>	<i>Qualitative description</i>
Values and Attitudes	4.28	Very often	4.34	Very often
Teaching Practices and Strategies	4.31	Very often	4.39	Very often
Gender equality	4.39	Very often	4.62	Very often
Overall Mean	4.32	Very often	4.43	Very often

Note: 4.21-5.00 = Very Often; 3.41-4.20 = Often; 2.61-3.40 = Sometimes; 1.81-2.60 = Rarely; 1.00-1.80 = Never

For values and attitudes, respect for students' gender preferences was highly rated, with means of 4.44 among students and 4.56 among faculty. However, gender-sensitive language received a comparatively lower student rating of 4.01, interpreted as 'Often', compared with the faculty rating of 4.24 or 'Very Often'. This suggests that while faculty generally demonstrate respect and acceptance regardless of gender, the consistent use of inclusive language remains an area for improvement. In teaching practices and strategies, cooperative learning, objective evaluation, adequate thinking time, and management of gender-related concerns were frequently demonstrated, indicating that gender responsiveness was reflected in instructional processes and classroom management.

Despite the generally positive results, classroom seating arrangements that facilitate equal participation received comparatively lower ratings, at 4.18 from students and 4.06 from faculty. In essence, the findings show that gender equality was the strongest aspect of gender-sensitive teaching, particularly through non-discriminatory treatment and equitable opportunities. Nevertheless, the findings indicate opportunities to further strengthen the consistent use of gender-sensitive language and the organisation of classroom arrangements that promote equal participation.

Differences Between Faculty Self-Assessments and Students' Observations

Table 2 presents the differences between faculty self-assessments and students' observations of gender-sensitive teaching across three major dimensions. For Values and Attitudes, students reported a mean of 4.28, while faculty reported 4.34, with a *t*-value of -2.83 and a *p*-value of .005, indicating a statistically significant difference. For Teaching Practices and Strategies, students obtained a mean of 4.31, compared with 4.39 for faculty, with a *t*-value of -3.14 and a *p*-value of .002, also indicating a significant

difference. Meanwhile, for Gender Equality, students reported a mean of 4.39, whereas faculty reported 4.62, with a *t*-value of -8.88 and a *p*-value of .001, showing the largest and statistically significant difference among the three dimensions. Since all *p*-values are below the .05 level, the differences between faculty and students are statistically significant.

The findings for Values and Attitudes, with students' mean of 4.28 and faculty's mean of 4.34, suggest that both groups generally perceive faculty values and attitudes toward gender sensitivity positively. However, the higher faculty mean indicates that faculty members assess themselves as more consistently demonstrating gender-sensitive values than students observe. This difference may be associated with how faculty demonstrate respect, tolerance, fairness, and inclusive language during classroom interactions. Faculty may believe that they consistently practice these values, while students may not always recognise or experience them at the same level. Thus, the result suggests that positive intentions and self-perceptions among faculty do not always correspond completely with students' classroom experiences.

For Teaching Practices and Strategies, the students' mean of 4.31 and faculty mean of 4.39, together with the *t*-value of -3.14 and *p*-value of .002, indicate another significant perceptual difference. Faculty members perceive themselves as more consistently implementing gender-responsive teaching strategies than students observe. These strategies may include providing equal opportunities for participation, using cooperative learning, ensuring objective assessment, encouraging student responses, and maintaining inclusive classroom activities. The difference suggests that while faculty members may believe that these strategies are being implemented effectively, students may experience their application as somewhat less consistent. This finding highlights the importance of examining not only what faculty intend to implement but also how students actually experience and perceive those teaching practices.

Table 2: Differences between faculty self-assessments and students' observations of gender-sensitive teaching

Major dimension	Students' mean	Faculty mean	<i>t</i> -value	<i>p</i> -value	Interpretation
Values and attitudes	4.28	4.34	-2.83*	.005	Significant
Teaching practices and strategies	4.31	4.39	-3.14*	.002	Significant
Gender equality	4.39	4.62	-8.88*	.001	Significant

Note: *p* < .05 indicates a statistically significant difference

The most pronounced difference appears for Gender Equality, where students reported a mean of 4.39, compared with the faculty mean of 4.62, producing a t-value of -8.88 and p-value of .001. This substantial difference indicates that faculty members perceive themselves as strongly promoting gender equality, while students observe these practices at a comparatively lower level. The difference may relate to students' perceptions of equal expectations, equitable participation, unbiased treatment, and the creation of supportive classroom environments.

Collectively, the results presented in Table 2 demonstrate a consistent perceptual gap between faculty self-assessments and students' observations across all three dimensions. Although the ratings of both groups remain generally positive, the consistently higher faculty ratings suggest the need for systematic student feedback, reflective teaching, classroom observation, and professional development to ensure that gender-sensitive intentions are translated into practices that are consistently visible, equitable, and experienced by students.

Emerging Issues and Challenges in Gender-Sensitive Teaching

The thematic analysis of faculty and student responses identified six major issues and challenges associated with gender-sensitive teaching.

Inconsistent Understanding and Application of Gender-Sensitive Language

The faculty acknowledged the need to become more conscious of gender-neutral and gender-sensitive terminology. Students similarly emphasised that teachers should carefully consider their choice of words because students have different levels of sensitivity. Although inclusive language was observed in some classrooms, its use was not consistent. The findings indicate differences in faculty knowledge and confidence regarding appropriate gender-sensitive expressions.

Balancing Personal Beliefs and Professional Responsibilities for Inclusion

The faculty responses revealed tensions between personal convictions and professional expectations related to gender inclusivity. Some faculty members expressed respect for diverse students

while acknowledging personal beliefs that influence how they understand gender-related concerns. This creates challenges when discussing gender identity, gender expression, and related issues in the classroom.

Gaps Between Awareness and Actual Classroom Practice

Faculty members generally expressed awareness of gender sensitivity, but some reported uncertainty when addressing gender bias and sensitive gender issues. Students likewise recognised faculty efforts while indicating that further institutional learning was necessary. The findings suggest that awareness of gender equality does not automatically result in confident and consistent gender-responsive pedagogy.

Ensuring Equitable Participation and Inclusive Learning Opportunities

Faculty reported using mixed-gender groupings, equal task distribution, and random calling during classroom activities. Students generally recognised these practices as fair and non-discriminatory. However, the responses suggest that many strategies emphasise equal treatment rather than equity. Equal treatment may not always address differences in students' confidence, experiences, needs, and participation patterns.

Emotional Safety and the Social-Emotional Demands of Gender-Responsive Teaching

Both faculty and students emphasised the importance of making students feel safe, included, and respected. Students particularly valued teachers who carefully managed language and interactions involving gender differences. The faculty, however, expressed uncertainty regarding sensitive discussions and possible student reactions. Gender-responsive teaching therefore involves emotional and communicative demands that require faculty competence in inclusive dialogue and sensitive classroom facilitation.

Need for Systematic Institutional Support and Professional Development

Faculty and students strongly identified the need for seminars, training, and structured learning opportunities on gender sensitivity. The faculty

specifically emphasised the importance of improving knowledge of gender identity, orientation, inclusive terminology, and classroom strategies. Students likewise recognised the need for increased awareness and behavioural change. The findings indicate that sustainable gender-responsive pedagogy cannot depend exclusively on individual faculty initiative.

DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that faculty members at Isabela State University (ISU) demonstrate a generally high level of engagement in gender-sensitive teaching. Both faculty members and students described most practices as occurring 'Very Often', suggesting that respect, inclusion, equitable participation, and gender equality are evident in classroom interactions. This supports the view that gender-responsive pedagogy is influenced not only by instructional strategies but also by educators' values, attitudes, and conscious pedagogical decisions (Khalil et al. 2024; Ramanan and Mohamad 2025). However, the favourable findings should not be interpreted as evidence that gender-responsive teaching is already fully institutionalised, but rather as an indication of a strong foundation that still requires continuous improvement.

Gender equality emerged as the most strongly manifested dimension. Faculty members were generally perceived as maintaining equal expectations, encouraging participation, and treating learners without gender bias. These practices are consistent with gender-responsive pedagogy, particularly its emphasis on reducing discriminatory barriers and providing meaningful opportunities for participation (Hailu et al. 2023; Kihwele et al. 2025). Nevertheless, equality should not be understood simply as treating everyone in exactly the same manner. Students differ in confidence, prior experiences, social expectations, and willingness to participate, and therefore, uniform treatment may not always result in equitable classroom experiences.

An important finding is the perceptual gap between faculty members and students. Faculty members tended to assess their practices more positively than students did, suggesting that pedagogical intentions may not always be experienced by learners with the same degree of consistency. This difference may reflect varying understandings of what constitutes gender-responsive teaching. While fac-

ulty members may consider equal treatment and opportunities sufficient, students may evaluate practices according to whether they actually feel included, respected, supported, and able to participate. This finding reinforces the importance of considering students' experiences alongside faculty self-assessments (Miralles-Cardona 2025; Panadero et al. 2023; Shay et al. 2025).

The difference was particularly evident in the use of gender-sensitive language. Although respect for students' gender preferences was rated 'Very Often', students perceived gender-sensitive language as occurring only 'Often'. The qualitative findings similarly identified concerns regarding understanding and consistently applying inclusive terminology. Since language is a direct and visible part of classroom interaction, unintended or inconsistent word choices may influence students' perceptions of inclusion. Thus, gender-sensitive teaching requires more than respectful intentions, as it also requires knowledge, awareness, and consistent use of appropriate language.

Teaching practices and strategies were likewise generally rated 'Very Often', particularly cooperative learning, objective evaluation, and opportunities for participation. These practices indicate that faculty members are already using approaches that can support inclusive learning environments. However, seating arrangements that facilitate equitable participation were less consistently implemented. This finding is important because classroom organisation, although seemingly procedural, can influence interaction, visibility, collaboration, and opportunities to participate. Gender-responsive teaching therefore extends beyond explicit gender-related activities to include everyday decisions about classroom structure and participation.

The qualitative findings also show that awareness of gender sensitivity does not always translate into confidence in addressing gender-related concerns. Faculty members acknowledged uncertainty when responding to gender bias or sensitive situations, while students recognised faculty efforts but emphasised the need for continued learning. This suggests a gap between understanding gender-responsive principles and applying them in complex classroom situations. Faculty development should therefore move beyond awareness-raising and provide practical strategies for responding to gender-related concerns, facilitating sensitive discussions, and managing classroom interactions appropriately.

Another concern involves the relationship between personal beliefs and professional responsibilities. Although faculty members generally expressed respect for diverse learners, personal convictions sometimes influenced their understanding of gender-related issues. Such tensions may become more evident when discussions involve gender identity, gender expression, or other value-laden topics. Karousiou et al. (2025) and Mcpherson et al. (2023) noted that educators may experience difficulties when controversial issues intersect with personal, cultural, or religious beliefs. Institutional guidance is therefore important in helping faculty distinguish personal perspectives from their professional responsibility to maintain a respectful and non-discriminatory learning environment.

The social-emotional dimension of gender-responsive teaching is also significant. Students valued respectful interactions and careful language, while faculty members expressed uncertainty about facilitating sensitive discussions and responding to student reactions. These situations require not only pedagogical knowledge but also empathy, communication skills, emotional awareness, and sound judgment. As suggested by Carter et al. (2025), Guberina (2023) and Lapidot-Lefler (2025), socially and emotionally responsive teaching can contribute to supportive learning environments. Faculty development should therefore include inclusive communication, conflict-sensitive dialogue, active listening, and strategies for managing difficult classroom conversations.

The repeated calls for seminars, training, and structured learning opportunities suggest that gender-sensitive teaching should not depend solely on individual awareness or initiative. Both faculty members and students identified the need for greater understanding of gender identity, inclusive terminology, and appropriate classroom responses. Sustainable gender-responsive pedagogy requires institutional mechanisms that connect professional development with curriculum, policy, monitoring, and feedback (Anthuvan et al. 2025; Duma 2022; Yuma 2025). Student feedback, reflective self-assessment, peer observation, and gender-responsive teaching reviews may help identify differences between faculty intentions and students' actual experiences.

Taken together, the findings show that ISU has a strong foundation for gender-responsive pedagogy. Faculty members demonstrate positive attitudes toward inclusion and gender equality, and

many gender-sensitive practices are already evident in classroom teaching. However, the findings also reveal areas requiring continued attention, particularly the consistent use of gender-sensitive language, the application of gender awareness in complex situations, equitable participation, and the management of sensitive discussions. The central issue is therefore not the absence of faculty commitment but the consistency with which gender-sensitive intentions are translated into students' classroom experiences. Strengthening reflective practice, student feedback, professional development, and institutional guidance can help ISU move from equality-oriented practices toward a more consistent, equity-responsive, and meaningful gender-responsive learning environment.

CONCLUSION

This study found that faculty members at Isabela State University generally demonstrate high engagement in gender-sensitive teaching, particularly in promoting respect for gender diversity, inclusive teaching practices, equitable participation, and unbiased treatment. Gender equality emerged as the strongest dimension, indicating a generally favourable foundation for gender-responsive pedagogy.

However, the significant differences between faculty self-assessments and students' observations indicate a perceptual gap between faculty intentions and students' classroom experiences. While faculty generally rated their gender-sensitive practices more favourably, students identified areas where gender-sensitive language, respectful interactions, inclusive strategies, objective evaluation, participation, and gender equality were not always experienced consistently. The qualitative findings further revealed challenges in applying gender-sensitive language, reconciling personal beliefs with professional responsibilities, translating awareness into practice, promoting equitable rather than merely equal participation, and managing sensitive gender-related discussions.

Collectively, the findings suggest that gender-responsive teaching requires both faculty commitment and institutional support. Sustained professional development, curriculum integration, systematic student feedback, and supportive institutional policies are essential to strengthen faculty competencies and bridge the gap between intended and experienced practices. These measures can facili-

tate the consistent integration of gender responsiveness into everyday teaching at Isabela State University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings, Isabela State University should institutionalise continuous professional development on gender-responsive pedagogy, with emphasis on gender-sensitive language, inclusive communication, equitable participation, unbiased assessment, and the facilitation of sensitive classroom discussions. Faculty development should move beyond general gender awareness by incorporating practical approaches such as case analysis, scenario-based workshops, and reflective teaching activities that enable faculty to translate gender-responsive principles into classroom practice.

The University should also integrate gender responsiveness into curriculum development and instructional review by regularly examining course syllabi, learning materials, classroom activities, and assessment practices for inclusive language, diverse representation, and equitable learning opportunities. In addition, structured student feedback mechanisms should be established to identify gaps between faculty intentions and students' classroom experiences. Such feedback should be developmental rather than punitive and linked to mentoring and professional development. Faculty should likewise be encouraged to adopt equity-oriented teaching approaches that recognise differences in students' experiences, needs, participation, and access to learning opportunities.

Finally, ISU should strengthen faculty competencies in inclusive communication, emotional intelligence, and sensitive dialogue, particularly in managing gender-related discussions and diverse gender expressions while maintaining academic and professional standards. A university-wide framework on gender-responsive pedagogy should align institutional policies with curriculum development, faculty development, teaching evaluation, student feedback, and quality assurance. Systematic implementation and monitoring of these measures can help bridge the gap between faculty intentions and students' experiences and strengthen ISU's contribution to SDG 4, SDG 5, and SDG 10.

LIMITATIONS

This study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. First,

the study was conducted at Isabela State University; therefore, the findings reflect the institutional context, policies, faculty practices, and student experiences of a single higher education institution and may not be directly generalisable to other universities. Second, the quantitative component relied on faculty self-assessments and student perceptions, which may have been influenced by social desirability, individual classroom experiences, teacher-student relationships, and personal understandings of gender sensitivity. Third, the qualitative component used written responses, which, although informative, may not have captured the depth of participants' experiences, particularly given the sensitive nature of gender-related issues. The study also did not directly observe classroom teaching or systematically analyse syllabi, instructional materials, assessment tools, or classroom discourse; thus, conclusions regarding actual implementation were primarily based on reported and perceived practices.

Future research should incorporate classroom observations, document analysis, and longitudinal assessments of faculty development to determine whether reported practices correspond with actual teaching behaviour. Further studies may also compare gender-responsive teaching practices across campuses, academic disciplines, faculty profiles, and student groups. Examining how gender identity and other learner characteristics intersect with classroom experiences may provide a more comprehensive understanding of inclusivity in higher education and strengthen the empirical basis for developing and evaluating gender-responsive pedagogy frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Anthuvan T, Prabhuram S, Maheshwari K, Mora-Avila P, Panda G 2025. Gender-responsive sustainability pedagogy (G-RESP): Bridging gender gaps in management and sustainability education. 10.2139/ssrn.5831523
- Bastida Jr EL, Abargos JA, De Lara RBR, Saysi JG, Geronimo JMS, Kim RA, Luching MES, Añonuevo BM 2025. The construction of gender-responsive classrooms in a higher education institution: An exploration of teachers' situated knowledge, pedagogical practices, and common challenges in promoting gender equality. *Indonesian Journal of Social Sciences*, 17(2): 104-119.
- Carter E, Shima L, Singal N 2025. Understanding and addressing gendered learning and socioemotional differences among students: Teachers' insights from Rwanda. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 1-23.
- Duma MG 2022. Gender mainstreaming plan for gender-responsive public schools. PUPIL: *International Journal of Teaching, Education and Learning*, 5(3): 144-161.

- Enoc J, Ray F, Gagani 2019. The development of a gender-sensitivity teaching test. *International Journal of Advanced Research and Publications*, 3(6): 17-24.
- Guberina T 2023. Cultivating inclusive learning environments: Incorporating diversity through culturally responsive pedagogy. *Social Science Chronicle*, 2(1): 1-14.
- Hailu MF, Lee EE, Halkiyo A, Tsotniashvili K, Tewari NR 2023. Gender and higher education in African universities: A critical discourse analysis of key policy mandates in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 31(23): n23.
- Halkiyo AB, Hailu MF, Lott BE 2023. Gender-based pedagogical inequity: Exploring faculty perspectives in Ethiopia. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2249668>
- Jabbar SA, Barkati MG, Tabish M 2025. The gender-sensitive pedagogy: Tools for promoting inclusivity in the classroom. *Diversitas Journal*, 10(2): 949-954. <https://doi.org/10.48017/dj.v10i2.3210>
- Karousiou C, Vrikki M, Evagorou M 2025. Teachers' perceptions on introducing sensitive and controversial issues in the classroom. *Frontiers in Education*, 10: 1481173.
- Khalil N, Aljanazrah A, Hamed G, Murtagh EM 2024. Teacher educators' perspectives on gender responsive pedagogy in higher education. *Irish Educational Studies*, 43(4): 903-919.
- Kihwele GE, Kinyota M, Moses I 2025. Pre-service teachers' conceptualisation of gender-responsive pedagogy as a strategy for achieving gender equality in classrooms. *Cogent Education*, 12(1): 2584919.
- Lapidot-Lefler N 2025. Teacher responsiveness in inclusive education: A participatory study of pedagogical practice, well-being, and sustainability. *Sustainability*, 17(7): 2919.
- Makamure G 2025. Promoting gender-responsive pedagogies in open education at Eswatini's higher education institutions. *SN Social Sciences*, 5(10): 162. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43545-025-01202-w>
- McPherson A, Forster D, Kerr K 2023. Controversial issues in the Australian educational context: Dimension of politics, policy and practice. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2): 113-127.
- Merma-Molina G, Urrea-Solano M, Hernández-Amorós MJ 2024. The integration of gender equality (SDG 5) into university teaching: The view from the frontline. *Innovative Higher Education*, 49(3): 419-452.
- Miralles-Cardona C 2025. Teaching gender equality in teacher education: Does existing practice actually support gender mainstreaming implementation? *Frontiers in Education*, 10.
- Mukagiahana J, Sibomana A, Ndiritu J 2024. Teachers' understanding of gender responsive pedagogy and its application in teaching process: Case after teacher training program interventions in Rwanda. *Journal of Pedagogical Research*, 8(1): 280-293.
- Naciti V, Noto G, Pulejo L, Vermiglio C 2024. Gender equality plan development in universities: A strategic management perspective. *European Journal of Volunteering and Community-Based Projects*, 1(1): 34-57.
- Nguru F 2023. Gender gap in science education: Pedagogical implications in a classroom in secondary schools in Tanzania. *International Journal of Curriculum Development and Learning Measurement*, 4(1): 1-18.
- Nkosi N, Maphalala M 2025. Advancing gender equity in higher education research. *African Journal of Inter/Multi-disciplinary Studies*, 7(si1): 1-14.
- Panadero E, García-Pérez D, Fernández Ruiz J, Fraile J, Sánchez-Iglesias I, Brown GT 2023. Feedback and year level effects on university students' self-efficacy and emotions during self-assessment: Positive impact of rubrics vs. instructor feedback. *Educational Psychology*, 43(7): 756-779.
- Pedrajas RP, Jalandoni ND 2023. Promoting gender equality in the classroom: Teachers' challenges and strategies. *Journal of Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, 14(3): 390-398.
- Ramanan B, Mohamad MZ 2025. Gender perspectives in education: Strengthening gender-responsive values to achieve sustainable development goals in the globalization era. *Journal of Gender and Millennium Development Studies*, 2(2): 87-100.
- Rosa R, Clavero S 2022. Gender equality in higher education and research. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31(1): 1-7.
- Shay JE, Hizer SE, Quick D, Manilay JO, Sanchez M, Sellers V 2025. Evolving equity consciousness: Intended and emergent outcomes of faculty development for inclusive excellence. *Trends in Higher Education*, 4(3): 37.
- Walsh A, Murtagh EM, Aljanazrah A, Hamed G 2025. Modelling gender equity in the classroom: From teacher educators to pre-service teachers and what gets lost in translation. *Oxford Review of Education*, 1-18.
- Yuma KS 2025. Promoting gender equity in education to ensure equal opportunities and inclusive learning environments. *Nusantara Education*, 4(2): 1-10.

Paper received for publication in July, 2026
Paper accepted for publication in August, 2026