

RESPONSIVENESS OF SECONDARY TEACHERS TO GENDER AWARENESS AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Dr. Annie C. Manalang ^a, Pascual Manalang ^b

^{ab} Urdaneta City University, Urdaneta City, Pangasinan Philippines

Corresponding email: manalang_annie@yahoo.com.ph

Abstract

This study determined the level of responsiveness of public secondary school teachers of the six (6) divisions of the province of Pangasinan to Gender Awareness and Development Programs S.Y. 2015-2016. The descriptive survey method will be the most appropriate method to use since it provides facts on which scientific judgment was based.

The findings are summarized in order of which the problems and hypothesis were raised in the study. 1) The teacher respondents of this study relatively belong to an age bracket of 21 to over 51 years of age; are largely female composed of 163 or 77.6 percent; a large number of them, that is 177 or 55.7 are with Masteral Degree Units; a larger number of 87 or 41.4 percent of them have 5 years of less number of years of teaching experience, with the rest having 10 to over 21 years, and remarkably have very positive attitude towards teaching. 2) The teacher-respondents' responsiveness towards Gender Awareness and Development Program obtained a Grand Weighted Mean rating of 4.37, which means very responsive. 3) The significant differences in the teachers responsiveness to GAD program were observed only across their age as indicated by an overall F-value of 2.829 which is significant at .040 level; and across their attitude toward teaching, as indicated by and overall t-value of -4.851 and df of 208 which is significant at .000 level, hence, both are significant at .05.

On the basis of the salient findings, and conclusions drawn, the following are hereby recommended. 1) The teachers shall take bold steps to upgrade their professional profile particularly with respect to: upgrading their educational qualifications through graduate studies; enriching the teaching experience through in- service trainings and sustaining with more enhancements, their very positive attitude towards teaching. 2) The teachers' responsiveness to GAD program should be sustained and should serve as wake-up call to all others to be compliant to the program. 3) There should be a research advocacy to explore other significant variables, concepts or constructs as good sources of variance as well as excellent indicators of relationships as features of scholarly research endeavour. 4) Similar research studies maybe conducted to further enhance or enrich this present study and make a difference.

Keywords: Responsiveness, Gender Awareness, Development Program

1. Introduction and Research Focus

Gender equality is a multi-sector issue. The media, for example influences to a large extent the image of both men and women in society. Some media images need to be corrected. Men and women are consistently portrayed stereotype roles such as teachers, nurses, homemakers and others. Strong men, weak women images are continuously portrayed in media. Women are portrayed as sex symbols and as art objects. The good women as portrayed in media is associated with sacrifice, purity, compliance and subordination whereas the bad women is portrayed is portrayed as selfish, immoral, and aggressive. The misrepresentation of women in media and advertising must be put to an end. One such solution to issue is Gender and Development (GAD). It is an approach to a paradigm of development focusing on social, economic, political and cultural forces that determines how differently women and men

participate in, benefit from, and control resources and activities. It shifts the focus from women as a group to the socially determined relations between them. Its vision is “gender equality” where women and men equally benefit from development.

The world has recognized the importance of gender equality. The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the most widely ratified human rights treaty in history, sets forth provisions that include civil rights and freedoms, family environment, basic health and welfare, education, leisure and cultural activities and special protection measures for all children. Under Women as Education/Training Beneficiaries, the following concerns were raised: a) the issue of sexism and stereotypes that perpetuates sex role and dichotomy limit women’s participation to education and training, b) need for gender-sensitive counselling programs for students that encourage women’s entry into non-traditional courses, c) sexual harassment perpetuated by male teachers/professors (demanding a “date for a grade” from students).

2. Research Design

The descriptive survey design was used because the problems vary among themselves and the researcher is interested to know the extent to which different conditions was obtained. This method of research is a fact-finding study with adequate and accurate interpretations of the findings. It is described with emphasis what actually existed such as current conditions, practices situation or any phenomena. Since the study was concerned on the responsiveness of secondary teachers on gender awareness and development, the descriptive survey method was most appropriate method to use since it provides facts on which scientific judgement was based. The researcher will be using questionnaire in gathering and collecting data.

The teacher respondents were also categorized into their sex. Relative to this, there are 163 or 77.6 percent are females, and only 47 or 22.4 percent are males. Apparently the teacher respondents are female dominated, which is a common finding in many research studies already conducted in the field of education. Evidently the teaching profession is largely a woman’s world. Since, there is the general impression that school is the second home for school children, and then it could be that we find more women teachers in the school serving as surrogate or second mothers to these young learners.

The teacher respondents in this study were also determined to be variable in terms of their highest educational attainment. Table 2 likewise, shows that a greater number of them that is 117 or 55.7 percent are with masters’ degree units on top Of their bachelors’ degree. Nonetheless, there are 36 or 17.1 percent who are full pledged masters’ degree holder, 17 or 8.1 percent of whom are doctoral units’ earners. At least, there are 2 or 1.0 percent who are full-pledge doctoral degree holders, and with a relative number of 38 or 18.1 percent who still remain in the bachelors’ degree. Pertinent to the professional upgrading there are still teachers from among the respondents in this study who are very much wanting of undertaking advance education in the post graduate level and a large number of whom to be encouraged to become fell-pledge masters’ degree holders and likewise to pursue the highest level of the doctorate degree.

Table 1: Respondents Profile in Terms of Age, Sex, Highest Educational Attainment, Number of Years in Teaching and Highest Trainings Attended.

Profile Variables		Frequency	Percent
Age	21 - 30	57	27.1
	31 - 40	68	32.4
	41 - 50	53	25.2
	51 and above	32	15.2
	Total	210	100.0
Sex	Male	47	22.4
	Female	163	77.6
	Total	210	100.0
Educational Attainment	BSE/BSEED/BS	38	18.1
	With MA units	117	55.7
	MA Degree Holder	36	17.1
	With Doctoral units	17	8.1
	Ed.D/Ph.D Degree Holder	2	1.0
	Total	210	100.0
Number of Years in Teaching	below 5 years	87	41.4
	6 - 10 years	45	21.4
	11 - 15 years	9	4.3
	16 - 20 years	25	11.9
	over 21 years	44	21.0
	Total	210	100.0
Highest Training Attended	District level	89	42.4
	Division level	104	49.5
	Regional level	12	5.7
	National level	2	1.0
	International level	3	1.4

Table 2 further reveals that in terms of such variables, the largest number, which is 87 or 41.4 percent out of their total of 210 covered in this study, have the least number of teaching experience, which is 5 years and below. The Department of Education (DepED) refers to them as novice teachers, which means that they are in their novitiate status or still neophytes in the teaching profession. As such they are expected to be more enthusiastic and full of initiative in the practice of their teaching profession. The rest of the teachers have relatively 6 to over 21 years of teaching experience and are expected to be practicing their teaching profession with expertise and mastery. As such they could be considered as better experienced and serve as models to their neophyte counterparts.

In terms of this variable, the teacher respondents were categorized into highest level of training attended. This is with the presumption that the higher level of trainings they have attended, the more they have participated in the lower levels. It appears in the table that a large number of the teacher respondents have gone only up to the division level as indicated by 104 or 49.5 percent out of 210 of them all. This means that the teacher are still very much wanting of attending

regional, national and international trainings and seminars. At least, 2 or 1.0 percent nevertheless, have attended national level, and 3 or 1.4 percent have participated in the international level.

On the basis of data, it can generally be observed that the teacher respondents have a very positive attitude toward teaching in practically all the parameters used in this study, except in their attitude toward evaluation. This is indicated by weighted mean values ranging from 4.36 to 4.67 all of which means very positive attitude. Their attitude toward evaluation on the other hand is just positive with a weighted mean value of 4.06. These data imply that while the teachers have very positive attitudes toward teaching, time management, planning, implementation and toward learners, they are not completely very positive toward evaluation. Whatever is the reason, evaluation as a component of teaching and learning process is a very vital, without which the whole educative process is very vital, without which, the whole educative process will have no way and no direction.

Table 2: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Culture Sensitivity

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. distinctive patterns of ideas, beliefs and norms which characterize the way of life and relations of a society.	4.60	VR
2. culturally determined gender ideologies define rights and responsibilities and what is appropriate behavior for women and men.	4.64	VR
3. influencing access to and control over resources and participation in decision making.	4.43	VR
4. gender ideologies often make power and the idea of women's inferiority.	4.31	VR
5. the concept of globalization which has implications for the diffusion culture particularly of western culture.	4.32	VR
6. the deference of culture and tradition which is often used by men to justify practices that constrain women's life chances and outcomes.	4.33	VR
7. the goals of gender equity because they perceive these as interfering with the most ultimate domain in society.	4.50	VR
8. that dominant cultures reinforce the position of those with economic, political and social orders.	4.29	VR
9. real issues of concern for local women's groups when externally initiated interventions are tainted by colonial attitudes.	4.30	VR
10. paternalistic ideas to justify the colonial domination of male colonizers.	4.10	R

AWM	Legend:	VR
	Rating Scale	
	Transmuted Rating	
	4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
	3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
	2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
	1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Responsive
	1.00 – 1.79	Not Responsive

It is reflected in the table that they are very responsive to culture sensitivity in general as indicated by an over-all weighted mean of 4.38. In fact their highest mean of 4.64 being very responsive is on their responsiveness to culturally determined gender ideologies, defined rights and responsibilities and to what is the appropriate behavior for women and men. More interestingly, when it comes to statement in item 10, which somehow expresses bias in favor of men, the teachers affirmed that they are not very responsive as indicated by a weighted mean of 4.10, equivalent to just responsive. This implies that they are firm in claiming that they are really very responsive to culture sensitivity relative to gender awareness and development.

3. Gender Analysis

Another dimension of determining teachers' responsiveness to gender awareness and development is gender analysis. This involves responsiveness to analysis and understanding of concepts, frameworks, gender mainstreaming, and other trends, issues and many other theories and dynamics of gender roles and gender relations. Table 4 provides the data on teachers' responsiveness to gender analysis.

It can be observed from the table that the teachers claimed to have a very responsive stance to gender awareness and development in terms of gender analysis, as indicated by a general weighted mean of 4.37. The teachers were very consistent in affirming this as indicated by a general weighted mean values of different measures ranging from 4.29 to 4.44, which are all very responsive. In this regard the teachers are particularly very responsive to analysis of gender role framework focusing on women and men's roles on gender differences and social relations to understand gender inequities on the impact of projects on both productive and reproductive roles, on gender powered relations and similar others.

Table 4: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Analysis

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. systematic gathering and examination of information on gender differences and social relations in order to identify, understand and redress inequities based on gender.	4.43	VR
2. valuable descriptive and diagnostic tool for development planners which is crucial to gender mainstreaming efforts.	4.30	VR
3. methodology and components of gender analysis which are shaped by how gender issues are understood in the institution.	4.36	VR

4. number of different approaches to the gender analysis including the gender roles framework.	4.30	VR
5. gender roles framework which focuses on describing women's and men's roles and their relative access to and control over resources.	4.44	VR
6. gender analysis which aims to anticipate the impact of projects on both productive and reproductive roles.	4.42	VR
7. social relations approach which seeks to expose the gendered power relations that perpetuate inequities.	4.34	VR
8. understand the dynamics of gender relations in different institutional contexts and thereby to identify women's bargaining position and formulate strategies for improvement.	4.42	VR
9. gender analysis which uncovers differences between women and divided by other aspects of social differentiation such as class, race and ethnicity.	4.37	VR
10. gender roles framework as a unit of analysis tends to assume that women are homogenous category.	4.29	VR
AWM	4.37	VR

Legend:

Rating Scale	Transmuted Rating
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Responsive
1.00 – 1.79	Not Responsive

3.1 Gender Discrimination

This refers to the negative or unfavorable treatment of individuals on the basis of their gender, such as denial of rights, opportunities or resources, or unequal or less value placed on their life because of their gender and other forms of prejudicial attitude due to gender. In this study, it identifies one of the variables. Table 5 presents the data on the teachers' responsiveness to gender discrimination as component of the gender awareness and development program.

Table 5: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Discrimination

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. unfavorable treatment of individuals on the basis of their gender, which denies their rights, opportunities and resources.	4.45	VR
2. most women across the world are treated unequally and less value placed on their life because of their gender.	4.20	VR
3. differential access among women's to power and control of resources is central to the discrimination in all institutional spheres.	4.16	VR
4. women and girls can free discrimination in the sharing of household resources including food sometimes leading to higher malnutrition and mortality indicators among women.	4.35	VR
5. gender discrimination can led to some preference, expressed in sex, selective abortion or female feticide.	4.35	VR
6. unequal pay in the local market and occupational exclusion limit women's earnings in comparison to those of men of similar education levels.	4.28	VR
7. women's lack of representation and voice in decision making bodies in the community and states perpetuate discrimination.	4.24	VR
8. gender discrimination is a product of culture with oppressive ideologies.	4.29	VR
9. national legal provisions uphold gender equality principles religious in other customary laws that previlize men may take precedence in practices.	4.24	VR
10. CEDAW is a key tool to support the struggle against discrimination in all spheres, pushing governments towards attaining these internationally recognized minimum standards.	4.27	VR
AWM	4.28	VR

Legend:**Rating Scale Transmuted Rating****4.20 – 5.00 Highly Responsive****3.40 – 4.19 Responsive****2.60 – 3.39 Moderately Responsive****1.80 – 2.59 Slightly Responsive****1.00 – 1.79 Not Responsive**

It can be observed from the table that the teachers are as well very responsive to gender discrimination in the different indicators with weighted mean values ranging from 4.20-4.25, with a general total weighted mean value of 4.28. This finding indicating that teachers are very responsive are very responsive to gender discrimination could be considered a potent tool for challenging gender discrimination issues particularly those against women. In short, this study could be a wake-up call in support to the women's clamor and struggle against gender discrimination in all spheres, specifically those involving human rights issues, including freedom from discrimination. In addition, this part of the study is also relative to the holding of the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1997, that brought into international focus the rights of women, and which until now, is pushing governments towards the attainment of internationally recognized minimum standards of elimination of discrimination against women.

3.2 Gender Division of Labor

As a component of the Gender Awareness and Development Program, gender division of labor has something to do with socially determined ideas and practices that define what roles and activities are deemed appropriate for men and for women. Sometimes, there are roles and activities viewed as natural and immutable depending upon gender, hence, the concept of division of labor. The data for responsiveness of the teachers to gender division of labor are shown in table 6.

Table 6: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Division of Labor

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. socially determined ideas and practices which define what role and activities are deemed appropriate for men and women.	4.51	VR
2. gender division of labor tends to be seen as natural and immutable.	4.43	VR
3. gender divisions of labor are not necessarily rigidly defined in terms of men's and women's roles as is sometime assumed.	4.40	VR
4. accepted norm regarding gender division varies from actual practice.	4.37	VR
5. roles typically designated as female are almost invariably less valued than those designated as male.	4.20	VR
6. women are generally expected to fulfill the reproductive role of bearing and raising children, caring for other family members and household management task.	4.46	VR
7. men tends to be more associated with productive roles particularly paid work and market production.	4.29	VR
8. women's over all participation rates are rising in the labor market but they tend to be confined to a relatively low range of occupations or concentrated in lower grades than men.	4.25	VR
9. women's productive roles have been ignored in the informal sector and subsistence agriculture.	4.13	VR
10. women's labor is undervalued and it is often assumed by mainstream development policies to be infinitely elastic.	4.20	VR
AWM	4.32	VR

Legend:

Rating Scale	Transmuted Rating
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly

Responsive

1.00 – 1.79 Not Responsive

It can be gleaned from the table that the teacher respondents are very responsive to the concepts, issues and concerns of gender division of labor. This is indicated by weighted mean values ranging from 4.20 to 4.51 with a general total weighted mean of 4.32. This very responsive rating of the teachers to gender division of labor implies that they are very much concerned with issues and challenges involving gender division of labor like in the other Gender Awareness and development Areas as earlier presented in this study. Among these issues and challenges, that was rated the highest weighted mean value of 4.51 deals with ideas and practices prescribing the inherent roles and activities for women and for men and which have been deemed natural and immutable. But actual observation will tell that with conception of Gender Awareness and Development Program, gender division of labor is no longer very rigidly defined as to men's or women's roles. Today women can now be seen doing what is supposedly for me, such as police women, firewomen, women electrician, women transport drivers, and similar others. The other way around is also apparent such as men doing house-keeping as male receptionist and similar others.

3.3 Gender Equality and Equity

Gender equality and equity are understood to mean that both men and women have the same rights to enjoy all of life's conditions, realizing their full human potentials to contribute to and benefit from the results of development, and with the state, the society, and the government recognizing that all human beings are responsibly free and the same in dignity and rights. In this study, it addresses such issues and concerns regarding equality between men and women in life's opportunities, women's freedom from discrimination, equality in participation in public life, equality in the fight for social justice, equity based on needs, abilities, talents and interest, equity for transformational change, equity on gender relations and the like.

Table 7: provides the data of teachers' responsiveness to gender equality and equity.

Table 7: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Equality and Equity

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. gender equality denotes women having the same opportunities in life as men including the ability to anticipate in public sphere.	4.65	VR
2. liberal feminist idea that removing discrimination in opportunities for women allow them to achieve equal status to men.	4.48	VR
3. equal opportunities policies and legislation tackle the problem through measures to increase women's participation in public life.	4.59	VR
4. judicial reform is another key tool in the fight for equality but lack of implementation and enforcement might limit its impact.	4.46	VR
5. formal equality does not necessarily demand or ensure equality of outcomes.	4.39	VR
6. formal equality assumes that once the barriers to participation are removed, there is a level playing field.	4.37	VR
7. formal equality does not recognize that women's reality and experience maybe different from men's.	4.27	VR

8. gender equity denotes the equivalence in life outcomes for men and women, recognizing their different needs and interest and requiring redistribution of powers and resources.	4.53	VR
9. goal of gender equity moves beyond equality of opportunity by requiring transformative change.	4.46	VR
10. equity approach implies that all development policies and interventions need to be scrutinized for their impact on gender relations.	4.48	VR
AWM	4.47	

The table reveals that the teacher rated themselves as very responsive to gender awareness and development with respect to gender equality and equity with a general total weighted mean of 4.47 resulting from the average of the total weighted mean values ranging from 4.27 to 4.65. Specifically they are very responsive to the issue or challenge on women having the same opportunities in life as men, including the ability to participate in public affairs, with the highest mean rating of 4.65. Relative to this is likewise, their being very responsive to increasing women's participation in the resolution of problems through policies and legislations, with the next higher weighted mean value of 4.59. It is interesting to note at this point that gender equality and equity are large by of women concern and relatively the teacher respondents in this study compose a significantly large number of females, that is 163 as against the very small number of males, who are just 47.

Legend:

Rating Scale	Transmuted Rating
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Responsive
1.00 – 1.79	Not Responsive

3.4 Gender Mainstreaming

Gender mainstreaming is accordingly, a strategy adopted by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) to strengthen its impact on the situation of women and on gender equality. As conceived by other institutions, here in the country and abroad, it is designed to support a larger number of projects that address gender equality and such improvements in the economic and social status of women. It involves adoption of policies and projects across range of sectors to provide direct benefits for women, correct gender inequalities in education, health and microfinance, promote and facilities women's access to and benefits from development projects provide an assurance of equal right with men, removal of all forms of discrimination against women and similar other projects and programs involving women and development. On the whole gender mainstreaming seeks to integrate all concerns for women and development into policies, projects and development programs. Relative to all these, this study additionally looked into teachers' responsiveness to gender mainstreaming. The data for this are reflected in Table 8.

Table 8: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Mainstreaming

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. an organizational strategy to bring a gender perspective to all aspects of an institution policy and activities through building gender capacity and accountability.	4.51	VR
2. identification of a broader institutional change if pervasive male advantage was to be challenged.	4.36	VR
3. major development organizations and many governments have now embraced gender mainstreaming as a strategy for moving towards gender equality.	4.44	VR
4. gender concerns are seen as important to all aspects of development for all sectors and areas of activity.	4.51	VR
5. mainstreaming strategy is a fundamental part of the planning process.	4.46	VR
6. responsibility for the implementation of gender policy is diffused across the organizational structure rather than concentrated in a small central unit.	4.48	VR
7. agenda-setting approach to a mainstreaming seeks to transform the development agenda itself whilst prioritizing concerns.	4.35	VR
8. integrationist approach brings women's gender concerns into all of the existing policies and programs focusing on institutional procedure.	4.32	VR
9. any approach to mainstreaming requires sufficient resources as well as high level commitment and authority.	4.37	VR
10. combined strategy can be particularly powerful which involves the synergy of a catalytic central gender unit with a cross-sectoral policy oversight and monitoring role.	4.42	VR
AWM	4.42	VR

Legend:

Rating Scale	Transmuted Rating
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Responsive
1.00 – 1.79	Not Responsive

As reflected in the table, it can be observed that the teachers are very responsive in all the aspects of gender mainstreaming with weighted mean values ranging from 4.32-4.51, and their general total weighted mean rating is 4.42. These data imply that the teachers are very responsive and very much aware of gender mainstreaming of the Gender Awareness and Development Program.

3. 5 Gender Needs

Gender needs as a component of the Gender Awareness and development program entails the practical and strategic gender needs which are identified, prioritized and shared by women based on their common experiences. Examples of these practical needs are the provision for

adequate living conditions, such as healthcare and food provision, access to safe water sanitation as well as access to income earning opportunities.

Strategic gender needs, on the other hand are those identified by women that requires strategies for challenging male dominance and privileges. Examples of these are needs relate to inequalities in gender division of labor, to ownership and control of properties, to participation in decision-making, and to experiences of domestic and other sexual violence. All of these have been accordingly translated to the concept of gender needs. In this study gender needs and gender interest are used interchangeably, in which case the teacher respondents claimed to be very responsive to the gender needs of the Gender Awareness and Development Program. This is indicated by weighted mean values mean ranging from 4.32 to 4.55, with a general total weighted mean rating of 4.44, all equivalent to very responsive. This implies that the teachers are likewise, very much concerned with gender needs issues and challenges, as they do in the other areas as aforementioned.

Table 9: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Needs

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. shared and prioritized needs identified by women that arise from their common experience as a gender.	4.55	VR
2. certain women's interest and prioritized concern have been translates into concepts of gender needs.	4.47	VR
3. identifies ways in which women's gender interest, define by women themselves can be satisfied in the planning process.	4.51	VR
4. needs as well as interest result from a political process of contestation and interpretation and thus should not be externally defined or seen as fixed.	4.39	VR
5. practical gender needs are immediate need identified to assist their survival in their socially accepted roles within existing power structures.	4.48	VR
6. policies to meet practical gender needs identified by women to assist their survival in their socially accepted roles within existing power structure.	4.50	VR
7. practical gender needs do not directly challenge their inequalities even though these needs maybe a direct result of women's subordinate position in society.	4.32	VR
8. strategic gender needs are those needs identified by women that require strategies for challenging male dominance and privilege.	4.39	VR
9. strategic gender needs may relate to inequalities in the gender division of labor, in ownership and control of resources, in participation in decision making or to experience of domestic and other sexual violence.	4.40	VR
10. gender interests may not be prioritized over women's other interest which cut across these, such as those of class and race so assumptions cannot be made if women's solidarity.	4.40	VR
AWM	4.44	

Legend:

Rating Scale	Transmuted Rating
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Responsive
1.00 – 1.79	Not Responsive

3. 6 Gender Relations

The last parameter used in determining the teachers' responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development is gender relations. This involves hierarchical relations of power or authority between men and women which tends to subordinate women or place women in a disadvantaged position. It is sometimes referred to as hierarchies which are often taken as natural, but are socially determined relations, culturally based and are subject to change overtime. It tends to be more particular about the

connectedness of men and women's lives and to the imbalances of power embedded in male-female relations.

Gender relations are also explicitly observed in arrange of social institutions such as the family, the government and legal systems, in business and economic systems and the like. In this regard, gender relations were also looked into this study, with respect to teachers' responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development. Finally, they rated themselves very responsive to gender relations as indicated by weighted mean values ranging from 4.20 to 4.30, with a general total weighted mean of 4.29. So that until this final dimension of Gender Awareness and Development, the teachers were very consistent in affirming their very responsive position or attitudes towards Gender Awareness and Development.

Table 10: Level of Responsiveness of Public Secondary Teachers to Gender Awareness and Development Program along Gender Relations

Statement	WM	Descriptive Rating
1. hierarchical relations of power between women and men that tend to disadvantage women.	4.31	VR
2. gender relations differ in emphasis from those which take gender roles as a starting point.	4.39	VR
3. gender relations give more prominence to the correctedness of men's and women's lives.	4.32	VR
4. gender relations constitute and are constituted by a range of institutions such as the family legal systems or the market.	4.36	VR
5. gender relations are a resource which is drawn on daily to reinforce or redefined the rules, norms and practices which govern social institutions.	4.33	VR
6. women often have less bargaining power to affect change which institutions operate.	4.22	VR
7. women can be physically or sexually abused by male partners with relative impunity where they are perceived to transgress their accepted roles.	4.29	VR
8. women have been excluded from many institutional spheres on their participation circumscribed they often have less bargaining power to affect change.	4.20	VR
9. women's maybe reluctant to seek redress because male dominated judicial system is unsympathetic.	4.19	VR

10. hierarchical gender relations constrain development efforts.	4.28	VR
11. poverty reduction efforts are hampered where men use their authority to usurp control over resources targeted at women.	4.28	VR
AWM	4.29	VR

Legend:

Rating Scale	Transmuted Rating
4.20 – 5.00	Highly Responsive
3.40 – 4.19	Responsive
2.60 – 3.39	Moderately Responsive
1.80 – 2.59	Slightly Responsive
1.00 – 1.79	Not Responsive

The following Table 10 presents the summary of the overall weighted mean ratings of the different indicators of the teachers' responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development.

Table 10: Summary of the Overall Weighted Mean ratings of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development

Indicators	OWM	TR
Culture Sensitivity	4.38	VR
Gender Analysis	4.37	VR
Gender Discrimination	4.28	VR
Gender Division of Labor	4.32	VR
Gender Equality and Equity	4.47	VR
Gender Mainstreaming	4.42	VR
Gender needs	4.44	VR
Gender Relations	4.29	VR
Grand Total of OWM	4.37	VR

The table shows that the teacher-respondents were very consistent in affirming that they are very responsive to all the areas of the Gender Awareness and Development Program with a grand total of their overall weighted mean rating of 4.37. The teachers' claim of being very responsive to Gender Awareness and Development can be attributed to the fact gender awareness development in the Philippines is as old as forty one (41) years ago that began with the declaration of the International Women's Year in 1975 by the United Nations. Today, it is being operationalized by no less than the national government, through the adoption of the Philippine Plan for Gender Responsive development (PPDG) 1995-2025. It is a 30 year strategic plan which is being translated into policies, strategies, programs and projects for Filipino women. To operationalized the PPGD, the Philippine government, with its partners in the non government, organizations and the academe, formulated the Framework Plan for Women (FPW), which has three (3) priority areas, to wit: 1) promotion of women's economic empowerment, 2) protection and advancement of women's rights, and 3) promotion of gender responsive governance. all these are reasons and/or justification for the teachers "very responsive" responsiveness to the Gender Awareness and Development Program.

4. DIFFERENCES IN THE TEACHERS' RESPONSIVENESS TO GENDER AWARENESS AND DEVELOPMENT ACROSS THEIR PROFILE VARIABLES

To verify the hypothesis formulated in its null form, this study also ventured in determining the differences in the teachers' responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development across and between their profile variables namely: age, sex, higher educational attainment, number of years in teaching, trainings attended, and attitude toward teaching. This was done with the use of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and the T-test for differences.

Differences in Teachers' Responsiveness to GAD Across Age

The differences in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD across age was determined with the use of ANOVA. The results of the computation of ANOVA across age are presented in Table 11. It can be noted from the table that when the teachers are compared in their responsiveness to GAD across age, they are not comparable in responsiveness to gender analysis, gender discrimination and gender relations, as indicated by F-values 2.767, 3.614, and 3.479, which are significant at .043, .014 and .017 levels respectively.

What is more interesting to note from the table is that, the ANOVA test results further show that the teachers' responsiveness to GAD with respect to all its areas of concerns, included in this study, is not comparable across their ages, as indicated by an over-all F-value of 2.829, which is significantly at .040 level.

Table 11: ANOVA Test of Differences of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development Across Age

Gender Awareness and Development Program		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Culture Sensitivity	Between Groups	1.577	3	.526	2.059	.107
	Within Groups	52.588	206	.255		
	Total	54.165	209			
Gender Analysis	Between Groups	3.020	3	1.007	2.767	.043
	Within Groups	74.946	206	.364		
	Total	77.967	209			
Gender Discrimination	Between Groups	4.564	3	1.521	3.614	.014
	Within Groups	86.721	206	.421		
	Total	91.285	209			
Gender Division of Labor	Between Groups	2.849	3	.950	2.548	.057
	Within Groups	76.773	206	.373		
	Total	79.622	209			
Gender Equality and Equity	Between Groups	.655	3	.218	.755	.521
	Within Groups	59.635	206	.289		
	Total	60.290	209			
Gender Mainstreaming	Between Groups	1.526	3	.509	1.743	.159
	Within Groups	60.099	206	.292		
	Total	61.625	209			

	Total	61.625	209			
Gender Needs	Between Groups	.783	3	.261	.820	.484
	Within Groups	65.525	206	.318		
	Total	66.308	209			
Gender Relations	Between Groups	4.151	3	1.384	3.479	.017
	Within Groups	81.925	206	.398		
	Total	86.076	209			
Overall Gender Awareness and Development Program	Between Groups	1.972	3	.657	2.829	.040
	Within Groups	47.872	206	.232		
	Total	49.844	209			

To further determine the specific age brackets in which the teachers are not comparable in their responsiveness to GAD across age, the Post-Hoc Multiple Comparisons (LSD) Test was computed, the results of which are appended in Tables 11a, 11b, 11c and 11d. It can be noted in Table 11a that these teachers who belong to age bracket 21-30 significantly differ in their responsiveness to gender analysis from those who belong to age bracket 51 and above. With respect to their responsiveness to gender discrimination, significant differences are observed between those who belong to 21-30 compared with 41-50 and with 57 and above years old, and eventually with respect to their responsiveness to gender relations, significant differences are observed between those who belong to 21-30 and 51 and above years old, as shown in Table 11c.

Remarkably, when the teachers are compared in their responsiveness to GAD as a whole program, significant differences can be observed between those who belong to 21-30 and 51 and above years old and between 31-40 and 51 and above years old, but which yields to an overall .040 level of significant difference.

Hence, on the bases of the above presentation it is herein declared that there are significant differences in teachers' responsiveness to GAD program, therefore the null hypothesis in this case is rejected. It can be argued at this point that age is a positive variable or a significant factor a basis for comparison in the teachers' responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development

5. Differences in the Teachers' Responsiveness to GAD Across Sex

The teachers were also compared in their responsiveness to GAD across sex. Since sex is a binomial variable, meaning it is made up of only two (2) categories, the T-test of significant differences was used. Table 12 presents the T-test results for significant differences in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD.

The T-test results in the table show that teachers are not comparable or they differ in their responsiveness to GAD only with respect to gender discrimination and gender relations. As indicated by the t-values of -2.767 and df of 208, and -1.980 and df of 208, which are significant at .006 and .049 levels. In this regards the null hypothesis of no significant differences is rejected. This means that the teachers are not comparable or they significantly differ in their responsiveness to gender discrimination and gender relations.

On the other hand, it is also reflected in the tables that the teachers themselves are comparables or do not differ in their specific responsiveness to culture sensitivity, gender analysis, gender division of labor, gender equality and equity, gender mainstreaming and gender needs. In addition, the t-test results for comparison of the teachers' responsiveness to the whole GAD program, does not indicate any significant difference, which is at .067 level. In view of this, the corresponding null hypothesis is accepted. This means that the teachers do not differ or they are comparable in their responsiveness to GAD when grouped into sex. This means further that sex is not a significant factor or variable for comparison in the teachers responsiveness to GAD.

Table 12: ANOVA Test of Differences of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development Across Sex

Gender Awareness and Development Program	Sex	Mean	Mean Difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Culture Sensitivity	Male	4.357447	-.0321237	-.380	208	.704
	Female	4.389571				
Gender Analysis	Male	4.214894	-.1955358	-1.947	208	.053
	Female	4.410429				
Gender Discrimination	Male	4.051064	-.2980159	-2.767	208	.006
	Female	4.349080				
Gender Division of Labor	Male	4.200000	-.1552147	-1.524	208	.129
	Female	4.355215				
Gender Equality and Equity	Male	4.385106	-.1044642	-1.176	208	.241
	Female	4.489571				
Gender Mainstreaming	Male	4.378723	-.0562459	-.625	208	.533
	Female	4.434969				
Gender Needs	Male	4.336170	-.1349954	-1.451	208	.148
	Female	4.471166				
Gender Relations	Male	4.125725	-.2089094	-1.980	208	.049
	Female	4.334635				
Overall Gender Awareness Program	Male	4.256141	-.1481881	-1.843	208	.067
	Female	4.404329				

6. Differences in the Teachers' Responsiveness to GAD Across Highest Educational Attainment

Furthermore, the teachers were compared in their responsiveness to GAD when grouped according to their highest educational attainment. Similarly, the ANOVA test of comparison was used. The data for the ANOVA test results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13: ANOVA Test of Differences of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development Across Highest Educational Attainment

Gender Awareness and Development Program		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Culture Sensitivity	Between Groups	.428	4	.107	.408	.802
	Within Groups	53.737	205	.262		
	Total	54.165	209			
Gender Analysis	Between Groups	.832	4	.208	.552	.697
	Within Groups	77.135	205	.376		
	Total	77.967	209			
Gender Discrimination	Between Groups	.757	4	.189	.428	.788
	Within Groups	90.528	205	.442		
	Total	91.285	209			
Gender Division of Labor	Between Groups	2.865	4	.716	1.913	.110
	Within Groups	76.758	205	.374		
	Total	79.622	209			
Gender Equality and Equity	Between Groups	.838	4	.210	.723	.577
	Within Groups	59.452	205	.290		
	Total	60.290	209			
Gender Mainstreaming	Between Groups	1.029	4	.257	.870	.483
	Within Groups	60.596	205	.296		
	Total	61.625	209			
Gender Needs	Between Groups	1.045	4	.261	.821	.513
	Within Groups	65.262	205	.318		
	Total	66.308	209			
Gender Relations	Between Groups	.553	4	.138	.331	.857
	Within Groups	85.523	205	.417		
	Total	86.076	209			
Overall Gender Awareness Program	Between Groups	.685	4	.171	.714	.583
	Within Groups	49.159	205	.240		
	Total	49.844	209			

It can be clearly be gleaned from the table that there is no indication of significant differences in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD in all its areas when they are grouped into

their highest educational attainment. this means that the teachers are comparable on the basis of their educational qualifications. Therefore, the corresponding null hypothesis is accepted at the .05 level of no significant difference.

In other words, highest educational attainment is not significant factor or variables for comparison of the teachers' responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development. This means that regardless of their highest educational attainment, the teachers are comparable or they do not significantly differ in their responsiveness to GAD.

7. Differences in the Teachers' Responsiveness to GAD Across Number of Years in Teaching

Likewise, the teachers were compared in the responsiveness to GAD across their number of years of teaching experience. The ANOVA test for comparison was also used. The data for the ANOVA test results are provided in Table 14.

It can be observed from the table that the teachers are not comparable or they significantly differ in their responsiveness to GAD in the areas of gender discrimination, gender division of labor, and gender mainstreaming. These are indicated by F-values of 2.903, 2.873 and 3.567 with corresponding significance levels of .023, .024 and .008 respectively. This means that when the teachers are grouped in accordance with the number of years of teaching, they significantly vary in their responsiveness to GAD in the areas as aforcited. Hence, the corresponding null hypothesis in this regard is rejected at .05 level.

Table 14
ANOVA Test of Differences of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development Across Number of Years in Teaching

Gender Awareness and Development Program		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Culture Sensitivity	Between Groups	.853	4	.213	.820	.514
	Within Groups	53.312	205	.260		
	Total	54.165	209			
Gender Analysis	Between Groups	1.688	4	.422	1.134	.342
	Within Groups	76.279	205	.372		
	Total	77.967	209			
Gender Discrimination	Between Groups	4.894	4	1.224	2.903	.023
	Within Groups	86.390	205	.421		
	Total	91.285	209			
Gender Division of Labor	Between Groups	4.227	4	1.057	2.873	.024
	Within Groups	75.396	205	.368		
	Total	79.622	209			
Gender Equality and Equity	Between Groups	.875	4	.219	.755	.556
	Within Groups	59.415	205	.290		
	Total	60.290	209			
Gender Mainstreaming	Between Groups	4.010	4	1.003	3.567	.008
	Within Groups	57.615	205	.281		
	Total	61.625	209			
Gender Needs	Between Groups	2.100	4	.525	1.676	.157
	Within Groups	64.208	205	.313		
	Total	66.308	209			

Gender Relations	Between Groups	3.178	4	.794	1.964	.101
	Within Groups	82.898	205	.404		
	Total	86.076	209			
Overall Gender Awareness Program	Between Groups	2.109	4	.527	2.264	.064
	Within Groups	47.735	205	.233		
	Total	49.844	209			

To determine further which specific groups of teachers when categorized into their number of years of experience, are not comparable or they significantly differ from one group to the other in their responsiveness to GAD, the Post-Hoc Multiple Comparison (LSD) test was used; the results of which are provided in tables 14a, 14b, 14c which are hereunto appended as appendix _____. With reference to table 14a, the differences in their responsiveness to gender discrimination can be noted between those who have below 5 years of teaching experience and those with 16-20 years in teaching as indicated by .010 level of significant difference; then between those 6-10 years compared with 16-20 years of teaching experience, as indicated by .004 level of significant difference; also those with 11-15 years compared with 16-20 years teaching experience as indicated by .007 level of significance; and those with 16-20 years compared with over 21 years of teaching experience as indicated by .037 level of significant difference.

With reference to table 14b, the existence of significant differences in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD area on gender division of labor across number of years in teaching can be observed between those below 5 years of teaching experience compared with 16-20 years of experience, indicated by .028 level of significant difference; between those with 6-10 and 16-20 years of experiences as indicated by .004 level of significant difference between those with 11-15 and 16-20 years of experience, as indicated by .006 level of significance.

Likewise, with reference to table 14c, the existence of significant differences in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD areas of gender mainstreaming can be observed when the following specific groups are compared as regard their number of years of teaching experience to wit: between those with below 5 years and 16-20, as indicated by .000 level of significant difference; those with 6-10 and 16-20 years of teaching as indicated by .003 level of significance; those with 11-15 and 16-20 years of teaching as indicated by .011 level of significance; and those with 16-20 and over 21 years of teaching experience as indicated by .007 level of significant difference.

In short, all the aforementioned data identified the specific groups of teachers who are not comparable or who significantly differ in their responsiveness to GAD areas of concern namely: gender discrimination, gender division of labor and gender mainstreaming, when said teachers are grouped according to their number of years of teaching.

Nonetheless, when the same teacher-respondents are compared in their responsiveness to the other GAD areas used in this study namely: culture sensitivity, gender analysis, gender needs, and gender relations, similarly on the basis of being grouped according to their number of years of experience, the same Table 14 clearly reveals that said teachers are simply comparable, do not vary or do not significantly differ, as indicated by the computed values of significance to wit: .514, .342, .556, .157 and .101 which are all higher than .05 level of acceptable significance index.

In addition, it can be noted from the table that the teachers, in fact, do not significantly differ in their responsiveness to the overall GAD areas as aforementioned, which is indicated by a higher significant value of .064 that the normally acceptable standard level of .05 level.

Hence, the corresponding null hypothesis is accepted at .05 level of significance. This means that the teacher-respondents are relatively comparable or do not significantly differ in their responsiveness to GAD. The number of years of teaching experience, is not after all a complete significant factor or variable for comparison of the teachers' responsiveness to the GAD Program.

8. Differences in the Teachers' Responsiveness to GAD Across Trainings Attended

In this study, the teachers were furthermore compared in their responsiveness to GAD on the basis of being grouped according to trainings they have attended. This is likewise done with the use of ANOVA test of significant differences. Table 15 provides the data for the ANOVA test results.

It can be gleaned from the table that the teachers are completely comparable or completely do not vary in their responsiveness to the whole GAD program. The table clearly reveals that the computed significant values are higher than the standard acceptable level of significance of .05 level. Therefore the corresponding null hypothesis is accepted at .05 level of significance. This implies that regardless of trainings attended, the teachers are comparable in their responsiveness to GAD. This means further that the level of training attended is a negative factor or variable for comparison in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD.

Table 15: ANOVA Test of Differences of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development Across Trainings Attended

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Culture Sensitivity	Between Groups	.972	4	.243	.937	.444
	Within Groups	53.193	205	.259		
	Total	54.165	209			
Gender Analysis	Between Groups	2.419	4	.605	1.641	.165
	Within Groups	75.548	205	.369		
	Total	77.967	209			
Gender Discrimination	Between Groups	1.476	4	.369	.842	.500
	Within Groups	89.809	205	.438		
	Total	91.285	209			
Gender Division of Labor	Between Groups	1.181	4	.295	.771	.545
	Within Groups	78.442	205	.383		
	Total	79.622	209			
Gender Equality and Equity	Between Groups	.814	4	.203	.701	.592
	Within Groups	59.476	205	.290		
	Total	60.290	209			
Gender Mainstreaming	Between Groups	1.551	4	.388	1.323	.263
	Within Groups	60.074	205	.293		
	Total	61.625	209			
Gender Needs	Between Groups	.938	4	.234	.735	.569
	Within Groups	65.370	205	.319		
	Total	66.308	209			
Gender Relations	Between Groups	2.544	4	.636	1.561	.186
	Within Groups	83.531	205	.407		
	Total	86.076	209			
Overall Gender Awareness Program	Between Groups	1.160	4	.290	1.221	.303
	Within Groups	48.684	205	.237		
	Total	49.844	209			

9. Differences in the Teachers' Responsiveness to GAD Across Attitude Toward Teaching

In the long run, this study also looked into the comparability of the teachers in their responsiveness to GAD on the basis of their attitude towards teaching. Since the result of the attitudinal measure came up with only two categories or group of teachers, the T-test of differences was used.

The data for the T-test results are shown in table 16.

Table 16: ANOVA Test of Differences of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development Across Attitudes toward Teaching

	Attitude towards Teaching	Mean	Mean Difference	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Culture Sensitivity	Favorable Attitude	4.300000	-.2471429	-3.399	208	.001
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.547143				
Gender Analysis	Favorable Attitude	4.237143	-.3885714	-4.546	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.625714				
Gender Discrimination	Favorable Attitude	4.200000	-.2471429	-2.589	208	.010
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.447143				
Gender Division of Labor	Favorable Attitude	4.209740	-.3322078	-3.793	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.541948				
Gender Equality and Equity	Favorable Attitude	4.370714	-.2864286	-3.756	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.657143				
Gender Mainstreaming	Favorable Attitude	4.292143	-.3907143	-5.214	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.682857				
Gender Needs	Favorable Attitude	4.319286	-.3650000	-4.639	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.684286				
Gender Relations	Favorable Attitude	4.161688	-.3785714	-4.186	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.540260				
Overall Gender Awareness Program	Favorable Attitude	4.261339	-.3294724	-4.851	208	.000
	Very Favorable Attitude	4.590812				

The table reflects that the teachers are completely non comparable in their responsiveness to GAD and its areas as indicated by the significant values ranging from .000-.010. It means that they completely differ in their responsiveness to GAD when grouped into having very positive attitudes toward teaching and positive attitude. Therefore the corresponding null hypothesis is rejected at .05 level of significance. This means that the teachers significantly differ or vary in their responsiveness to GAD compared as two (2) groups: one is with very positive attitude toward teaching and the other is with positive attitude. This implies that attitude towards teaching is an excellent factor or variable for comparison in the teachers' responsiveness to GAD.

10. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE TEACHERS' RESPONSIVENESS TO GAD AND THEIR PROFILE VARIABLES

Finally, this study also looked into the relationships between the teachers' responsiveness to GAD and their profile variables, namely: age, sex, educational attainment, number of years of teaching, training attended and attitude towards teaching. This was done by using the Pearson

Product Moment Correlation of Coefficient or Pearson r. The correlational values of r and their corresponding values of significance are provided in table 17.

It can be gleaned from the table that only age and attitude towards teaching of the teachers are significantly related to their responsiveness to GAD, as indicated by the overall values of r which are significant at .022 for age in relation to the teachers' responsiveness to GAD; and .000 for attitude towards teaching in relation to the teachers' responsiveness to GAD. So that in the case of the relationship between age and attitude towards teaching and the teachers' responsiveness to GAD, the corresponding null hypothesis is rejected at .05 level of significance.

Table 17: Relationship between the level of the Teachers' Responsiveness to Gender Awareness and Development and the Profile Variables

Profile Variables Gender Awareness And Development Program	Age		Sex		Education al Attainmen t		No. of Years in Teaching		Training Attended		Overall Attitude Towards Teaching	
	r _p - value	Sig	χ ² - value	Sig	r _p - valu e	Sig	r _p - valu e	Sig	χ ² - value	Sig	r _p - value	Sig
Culture Sensitivity	-.101	.145	1.601	.659	.022	.746	-.015	.827	16.223	.181	.390*	.000
Gender Analysis	-.168*	.015	4.463	.216	.123	.075	.055	.424	10.925	.532	.388**	.000
Gender Discrimination	-.222*	.001	14.66*	.002	.091	.188	.036	.609	5.196	.951	.285*	.000
Gender Division of Labor	-.169*	.014	7.588	.055	.126	.069	-.017	.807	8.787	.721	.367*	.000
Gender Equality	-.007	.915	2.247	.325	.022	.753	.058	.404	6.424	.600	.342*	.000
Gender Mainstreaming	-.088	.203	.398	.820	.077	.266	-.061	.380	10.901	.207	.408*	.000
Gender Needs	-.086	.214	5.670	.059	.076	.274	.004	.953	12.925	.114	.369*	.000
Gender Relations	-.222*	.001	7.870	.049	.007	.917	.147*	.033	10.639	.560	.394*	.000
Overall Gender Awareness	-.158*	.022	5.693	.058	.069	.319	.044	.525	8.888	.352	.439*	.000

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

However, in the case of the other profile variables of the teachers as mentioned earlier, it can be observed from table 17 that they do not indicate any significant relationship with their responsiveness to GAD as a whole, which leads to the acceptance of the corresponding null hypothesis at .05 level of confidence. It can be said therefore, that the teachers' profile variables are not related or associated and have nothing to do with their responsiveness to GAD, except their age, and attitude toward teaching