

An Assessment of the Role of Education in Promoting Social Equality among Selected Public Secondary Schools in Jolo

SUHARTO M. SUHAILI, LPT

Sulu State College Graduate Studies, Jolo, Sulu

*Corresponding author: gs@sulustatecollege.edu.ph

ABSTRACT. This research explored the varying perceptions regarding the role of education in advancing social equality among selected public secondary school teachers in Jolo. Utilizing a descriptive-exploratory research approach, the study gathered data from 100 purposively chosen public school educators in the area. Analytical tools such as frequency distribution, percentage, weighted mean, standard deviation, One-way ANOVA, and Pearson's correlation were employed for data interpretation. Key findings include: (1) The majority of respondents were female, aged between 25 and 50, predominantly married, mostly college graduates, permanently employed, and had up to 20 years of service; (2) On average, the participants expressed favorable views about the educational system's role in fostering social equality; (3) Significant differences in responses were noted when data were categorized by gender, marital status, educational background, and teaching experience. However, no significant differences emerged when grouped by age or employment status; (4) A strong and statistically significant positive correlation was observed among the variables related to educational access, inclusive curriculum design, and the overall school environment. These outcomes align with Pierre Bourdieu's Social Reproduction Theory, which posits that educational institutions may inadvertently perpetuate social inequalities. Despite this, the findings also highlight how school leaders in Jolo are proactively addressing such disparities through initiatives that promote equitable access to education, inclusive pedagogical practices, and supportive learning environments. The study underscores the need for sustained support for inclusive education, diverse curricular content, and fair allocation of educational resources to meet the needs of marginalized student populations, ultimately promoting social equity through education.

KEYWORDS: *Assessment, Education, Social Equality, Secondary Schools*

ARTICLE DETAILS

JEAS-00058; Received: April 05, 2025; Accepted: April 15, 2025; Published Online: May 15, 2025

CITATION:

Suhaili, Suharto M., LPT (2025). An Assessment of the Role of Education in Promoting Social Equality among Selected Public Secondary Schools in Jolo. Journal of Education and Academic Settings, 2(1). DOI: 10.62596/1h2w1k67

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by author(s). Journal of Education and Academic Settings is published by Stratworks Research Inc. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing redistribution and reproduction in any format or medium, provided the original work is cited or recognized.

Introduction

Education is widely acknowledged as a fundamental human right and a cornerstone in the pursuit of equity and social justice. It plays a vital role in enabling upward mobility, narrowing socio-economic disparities, and offering fair opportunities to individuals from all walks of life. Beyond simply transmitting knowledge, modern educational systems are expected to respond to deep-rooted social challenges especially inequality. Public secondary schools are particularly crucial in this endeavor as they serve a broad and often diverse population, including learners from underprivileged sectors. In areas such as Jolo, Sulu where cultural diversity intersects with poverty

and periodic conflict the question of whether education is truly functioning as a tool for social equality remains pressing (Chavez, 2020; Murro et al., 2023).

In the realm of education, social equality entails the fair distribution of opportunities, resources, and institutional support regardless of a student's background be it economic status, gender, or ethnicity. Ideally, schools should serve as social equalizers, offering every student the chance to succeed and escape cycles of deprivation. However, this vision is often challenged by on-the-ground realities. Research underscores that disparities in educational quality, infrastructure, and access often mirror broader societal inequalities, sometimes even reinforcing them (UNESCO, 2019; Chavez & Lamorinas, 2023; Chavez, 2023).

Given the socio-political climate in Jolo marked by limited access to services, high poverty rates, and historical conflict the role of public education becomes even more vital. Public secondary schools in this region are expected not only to educate but also to act as catalysts for peace and social integration. Increasing interest has been directed at evaluating whether these institutions are effectively addressing inequality and equipping students to rise above their socio-economic conditions. Literature suggests that inclusive education models, when implemented well, can drive meaningful change in areas affected by hardship and unrest (Garcia, 2021; Leon et al., 2024; Adalia et al., 2025).

This study, titled "An Assessment of the Role of Education in Promoting Social Equality among Selected Public Secondary Schools in Jolo," examines how effectively local schools contribute to equalizing educational opportunities. It investigates school-based factors such as resource allocation, teacher readiness, student support mechanisms, and leadership practices. Moreover, it looks into the pivotal roles played by teachers and administrators whose beliefs, instructional methods, and policy enforcement can either perpetuate or counter social inequality (Johnson & Perkins, 2020; Chavez et al., 2024).

The research also contextualizes internal school efforts within broader societal influences, including poverty, community engagement, and technological access. These external factors often shape educational outcomes and determine how far schools can go in promoting fairness (Baker, 2018; Chavez et al., 2024; Garcia et al., 2025). For instance, families with limited education or economic means may struggle to support their children's academic needs, especially in remote learning environments (Murro et al., 2023). Moreover, teacher workload, administrative burdens, and gaps in understanding inclusive practices can hinder progress (Chavez & Lamorinas, 2023; Leon et al., 2024; Dagoy et al., 2024).

Ultimately, this research aims to inform policy and practice by presenting actionable insights for improving equity in education, particularly in disadvantaged regions. As the global education community continues to confront the deepening inequality exacerbated by crises such as the COVID-19 pandemic, studies like this become ever more relevant (World Bank, 2020; Chavez, 2020). Through a localized lens, this study hopes to underscore the potential of education as a transformative force for building a more just and inclusive society.

Research Questions

This study aimed to ascertain the impact of social media Language Exposure on the Spelling Ability of English Language among MSU – Sulu Senior High School Students. Notably, the following queries were sought:

1. What is the demographic profile of the respondents in terms of:
 - 1.1 Age;
 - 1.2 Gender;

- 1.3 Strand; and
- 1.4 Grade Level?
2. What is the level of influence of Social Media Language exposure on the spelling ability of English Language among MSU – Sulu Senior High School students in terms of:
 - 2.1 Social Media Usage;
 - 2.2 Usage of Cyber slang; and
 - 2.3 Transfer to Academic Writing?
3. Is there a significant difference in the level of influence of Social Media Language exposure on the spelling ability of English Language among the respondents when data are categorized in accordance to their age, gender, strand, and grade level?
4. Is there a notable correlation among the subcategories included under the level of influence of Social Media Language exposure on the spelling ability of English Language among MSU – Sulu Senior High School students in terms of: social media usage, usage of Cyber slang, and transfer to Academic Writing?

Foreign Literature and Studies

Education as a Tool for Liberation. Education serves as a powerful instrument for social change and liberation. Paulo Freire (2019) emphasized that education should transcend mere knowledge transmission, fostering critical consciousness among the oppressed to challenge societal inequalities. Similarly, Amartya Sen's (1999) Development as Freedom framework underscores education's role in enhancing individual capabilities, enabling active participation in social, economic, and political spheres.

Reproduction of Social Inequality Through Education. However, education systems often perpetuate existing social structures. Pierre Bourdieu's (1977) Social Reproduction Theory posits that cultural capital such as knowledge and educational credentials disproportionately benefits dominant social classes, reinforcing class inequalities. James Coleman's (1966) study revealed that socio-economic background influences academic success more than school resources alone, highlighting the need to address socio-economic disparities alongside educational reform.

Promoting Inclusion Through Educational Policy. Addressing these disparities, UNESCO (2020) advocates for inclusive education policies that ensure quality education accessible to all, regardless of gender, ethnicity, or socio-economic status. Such policies contribute to improved social cohesion and offer marginalized students' greater opportunities for academic success. Inclusive education, as defined by Tony Ainscow (2015), involves adapting teaching methods and curricula to meet the diverse needs of students, fostering an environment where all learners can thrive.

Socioeconomic Factors in Student Support and Parenting. Annette Lareau's (2011) study on parenting styles reveals that middle-class parents often engage in "concerted cultivation," actively managing their children's education and extracurricular activities, aligning closely with school expectations. In contrast, working-class parents are less engaged in this manner, leading to disadvantages in educational systems that value the concerted approach. This disparity extends into educational settings, contributing to inequalities.

Interventions and Reforms for Educational Equity. The OECD (2020) emphasizes that equitable educational systems facilitate social mobility, particularly for individuals from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Policies reducing educational inequality, such as equal funding for schools and support for disadvantaged students, are essential for increasing opportunities for social mobility. Similarly, the World Bank (2018) highlights targeted interventions like

scholarships, cash transfers, and feeding programs as effective in promoting educational access for marginalized groups, reducing dropout rates, and improving attendance.

Critical Pedagogy and Social Awareness. Furthermore, critical pedagogy, as advocated by Henry Giroux (2011), encourages students to question and challenge oppressive societal structures, fostering critical thinking and social awareness. This approach empowers students to confront and address inequalities, promoting social justice through education.

In summary, while education holds the potential to drive social change and promote equality, it is essential to recognize and address the systemic inequalities within educational systems. Implementing inclusive policies, adapting teaching methods to diverse needs, and fostering critical consciousness among students are crucial steps toward achieving a more equitable and just society.

Local Literature and Studies

Geographical and Economic Barriers to Education in Rural Areas. Education in the Philippines faces significant barriers that hinder access to quality learning, especially for marginalized communities. Salazar (2016) identified geographical and economic obstacles in rural areas, such as poverty, limited transportation, and scarce educational resources, which perpetuate inequality. He emphasized that government subsidies and infrastructure improvements are crucial in addressing these access gaps.

Educational Experiences of Indigenous Peoples in Mindanao. In a related vein, Manzano (2018) examined the educational experiences of indigenous peoples in Mindanao, underscoring the importance of culturally relevant curricula. Incorporating indigenous knowledge in schools fosters student engagement and academic success, promoting social equality by recognizing diverse cultural backgrounds.

Socio-economic Barriers to Free Public Education. Despite the availability of free public education, Cruz (2020) highlighted socio-economic barriers like the costs of school supplies and transportation, which lead to higher dropout rates among students from low-income families. His research called for more comprehensive support systems to ensure these students' continued enrollment.

Historical and Socio-economic Roots of Educational Inequality. David and Mendoza (2019) explored the historical and socio-economic roots of educational inequality, arguing that colonial legacies and class disparities have shaped an education system that favors wealthier groups. They suggested that reforms such as equalizing public school funding and prioritizing disadvantaged students are necessary for addressing these systemic inequalities.

Culturally Inclusive Curriculum Development. Delos Reyes (2017) advocated for a culturally inclusive curriculum, finding that students perform better when their cultural heritage is reflected in their education. This approach helps promote social equality by making education more relevant and accessible to all students.

Resource-Rich School Environments and Social Equality in Rural Mindanao. In rural Mindanao, De Guzman (2021) examined how resource-rich school environments contribute to promoting social equality, recommending increased investment in infrastructure and teacher training to create equitable learning spaces.

Educational Reforms for Low-Income Students. Similarly, Angara (2015) highlighted the need for educational reforms aimed at improving teaching quality and resources for low-income students. His study emphasized the importance of addressing disparities in teaching materials and infrastructure to ensure quality education for all.

Challenges to Inclusivity in Public Secondary Schools. Villegas (2018) studied the challenges of inclusivity in public secondary schools, pointing out overcrowded classrooms and resource shortages as key barriers. He recommended reducing class sizes and increasing funding to address these issues to foster an inclusive and equal educational environment.

The Digital Divide and Access to Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic. The digital divide, particularly evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, was another significant challenge. Santos (2020) found that the shift to online learning disproportionately affected students from low-income families, highlighting the need for government intervention to ensure equal access to technology.

Education in Conflict-Affected Areas and Social Cohesion. In conflict-affected areas like Jolo, Carandang (2016) examined the role of education in fostering social cohesion. His research showed that schools can serve as safe spaces, helping to reduce tensions and promote equality by bridging divides among students from diverse backgrounds.

Gender Inclusivity in Education. Ramos (2019) focused on gender inclusivity, stressing that gender-responsive policies are essential, particularly in rural areas, to combat traditional gender roles that restrict girls' educational opportunities. Her study called for more comprehensive measures to create gender-equitable educational environments.

Challenges in the Implementation of the K-12 Curriculum. Bautista (2017) evaluated the K-12 curriculum's inclusivity and found that disadvantaged students often face challenges in adapting to its demands, calling for targeted support to assist these learners in overcoming educational hurdles and benefiting from the curriculum equally.

The Role of School Administrators in Promoting Inclusive Environments. Mercado (2020) discussed the pivotal role of school administrators in promoting inclusive environments, urging better training for leadership to prioritize equity and inclusivity in schools. Strong leadership can help ensure that all students, regardless of background, have access to equitable learning opportunities.

Community Engagement and Social Equality in Schools. Furthermore, Reyes and Flores (2021) explored the role of community engagement, emphasizing the importance of collaboration between schools and local communities to support marginalized students. Their research underscored how partnerships between educational institutions and the broader community can address resource gaps and enhance educational outcomes.

Challenges in Public Schools' Role in Promoting Social Equality. Lastly, Gonzales (2018) analyzed how public schools aim to promote social equality by providing free education but found that issues like overcrowding and inadequate resources undermine this goal. He advocated for increased government investment in public schools to improve the quality of education and ensure equitable opportunities for all students.

Methodology

Research methodology serves as a fundamental framework that outlines the entire research process in scientific investigations (Janea, 1985). It provides the structure for the researcher to present their findings to the scholarly community with precision and transparency (Harris, 1979; Scaff, 1982). The methodology encompasses the specific steps and techniques used in collecting empirical data essential for the study.

In line with the principles of scientific inquiry, this chapter provides a detailed exploration of the research approach, the location of the study, the participants involved, the sampling strategy,

data collection procedures, the instruments used for gathering data, as well as the measures of validity and reliability, and the statistical methods applied in analyzing the data.

1. *Research Design*

Given that this study tested several hypotheses, it was structured as a descriptive-exploratory research, aimed at describing and analyzing the extent to which education contributes to promoting social equality in selected public secondary schools in Jolo.

As Venson (2004) accurately explains, 'descriptive research design aims to interpret and reveal existing conditions, and through explanation, provides the necessary knowledge and insights that facilitate a deeper investigation.

2. *Research Locale and Respondents*

The research was carried out in several public secondary schools in Jolo, including Hadji Butu School of Arts and Trades, Jolo National High School, Jolo School of Fisheries, Jolo Agricultural School, Sulu National High School, Sulu State College Laboratory High School, and Mindanao State University Laboratory High School.

The participants in this study consisted of one hundred (100) teachers from various public secondary schools in Jolo, specifically from Hadji Butu School of Arts and Trades, Jolo National High School, Jolo School of Fisheries, Jolo Agricultural School, Sulu National High School, Sulu State College Laboratory High School, and Mindanao State University Laboratory High School.

Out of the total of one hundred (100) teachers, a sample was selected from each school to serve as representative respondents. The following table illustrates the distribution of respondents by school.

Distribution of the target Samples among Teacher-Respondents	
Public Secondary Schools in Jolo	Number of Teacher-Respondents
Hadji Butu School of Arts and Trades	14
Jolo National High School	14
Jolo School of Fisheries	14
Jolo Agricultural School	14
Sulu National High School	14
Sulu State College Laboratory High School	15
Mindanao State University Laboratory High School	15
TOTAL	100

3. *Sampling Design*

For this study, a purposive random sampling technique was employed to select the one hundred (100) teacher-respondents. The researcher intentionally chose these participants, ensuring equal representation by selecting fourteen (14) teachers from each of the five (5) National High Schools in Jolo, which included Hadji Butu School of Arts and Trades, Jolo National High School, Jolo School of Fisheries, Jolo Agricultural School, and Sulu National High School. Additionally, fifteen (15) teachers were chosen from the two (2) Laboratory High Schools, namely Sulu State

College Laboratory High School and Mindanao State University Laboratory High School, all located in the Municipality of Jolo.

The study was conducted over the Academic Year 2024-2025.

4. *Research Instrument*

To gather empirical data, the research instrument used was a questionnaire checklist, adapted from Villegas, L. D. (2018), titled "Challenges to Social Equality," which assessed factors influencing equality in public secondary schools.

The questionnaire was structured into two main sections. Part I gathered the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents, including gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, employment status, and length of service.

Part II of the instrument was further divided into three categories: access to education, curriculum inclusivity, and school environment.

To ensure the instrument was relevant to the current study, the researcher made necessary modifications and adjustments. These revised versions of the instrument were then validated for appropriateness by two (2) Panel of Experts from the School of Graduate Studies.

5. *Data Gathering Procedure*

A formal letter of permission to conduct the study was requested from the Office of the Dean of the Graduate Studies and addressed to the Schools Division Superintendent. Once permission was granted, letters requesting participation were sent to the school principals of the selected schools identified as respondents for the study.

The researcher personally administered the questionnaire checklist to the respondents at each of the aforementioned schools. Data collection was carried out by the researcher himself, and all responses were systematically coded. These responses were then reviewed and analyzed by a professional statistician to ensure appropriate statistical treatment and analysis.

Finally, the study was completed, and the final draft was written.

6. *Statistical Treatment of Data*

To generate primary empirical data for this study, the following statistical tools were applied:

1. For Research Problem 1, frequency and percentage were utilized to describe the demographic profile of the teacher-respondents, specifically in terms of gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, employment status, and years of service.
2. For Research Problem 2, weighted mean and standard deviation were employed to assess the extent to which education plays a role in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo, focusing on three areas: access to education, curriculum inclusivity, and the school environment.
3. For Research Problem 3, the T-test for independent samples was used to identify significant differences in the assessment of education's role in promoting social equality among teacher-respondents, grouped by gender. Additionally, One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to

examine significant differences based on age, civil status, educational attainment, employment status, and length of service.

4. For Research Problem 4, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was applied to evaluate the strength and direction of relationships between the sub-categories within the assessment of education’s role in promoting social equality, focusing on access to education, curriculum inclusivity, and school environment.

The scales in the table below will be adapted in the analysis of the results:

SCALE TO BE USED

Point	Scale Value	Interpretation
5	4.50 – 5.00	Strongly Agree
4	3.50 – 4.49	Agree
3	2.50 – 3.49	Moderately Agree
2	1.50 – 2.49	Disagree
1	1.00 – 1.49	Strongly Disagree

Results

This chapter presents the findings, analyses, and interpretations based on the data collected for this study. It provides an overview of the teacher-respondents' demographic characteristics, including gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, employment status, and years of service. Additionally, the chapter discusses the extent to which education is assessed as promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo, specifically in the areas of access to education, curriculum inclusivity, and the school environment. It also examines whether there are significant differences in the assessment of education's role in promoting social equality when respondents’ demographic profiles are considered. Finally, the chapter explores the correlation between the sub-categories related to the assessment of education’s role in promoting social equality, focusing on access to education, curriculum inclusivity, and the school environment.

Following the proper data scoring and statistical treatments, the results of the study are presented, analyzed, and interpreted in relation to each of the research questions.

1. What is the demographic profile of respondents in terms of: Gender, Age, Civil Status, Educational Attainment, Status of Employment, and Length of Service?

1.1 In terms of Gender

Table 1.1 the table below presents the gender breakdown of respondents from the selected public secondary schools in Jolo. Among the 100 respondents, 44% are male, while 56% are female. This indicates that a larger proportion of the study's participants are female, surpassing their male counterparts

Table 1.1 Demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of gender.

Gender	Number of Respondents	Percent	Cumulative percent
Male	44	44%	44%
Female	56	56%	100%

Total	100	100%
-------	-----	------

1.2 In terms of Age

Table 1.2 the table below illustrates the age distribution of respondents from the selected public secondary schools in Jolo. Out of the 100 respondents, 9% are between 20-25 years old, 31% are aged 26-30, 19% are between 31-35 years old, 35% fall in the 36-50 age range, and 6% are aged 51 and above. This indicates that the majority of respondents are between 26 and 50 years old.

Table 1.2 Demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of age.

Age	Number of Respondents	Percent	Cumulative percent
20 to 25 years old	9	9%	9%
26 to 30 years old	31	31%	40%
31 to 35 years old	19	19%	59%
36 to 50 years old	35	35%	94%
51 years old and above	6	6%	100%
Total	100	100%	

1.3 In terms of Civil Status

Table 1.3 the table below presents the civil status of the respondents from selected public secondary schools in Jolo. Out of the 100 respondents, 33% are single, 64% are married, and 3% are widowed or separated. This indicates that the majority of the respondents are married.

Table 1.3 Demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of civil status.

Civil Status	Number of Respondents	Percent	Cumulative percent
Single	33	33%	33%
Married	64	64%	97%
Widowed/ Separated	3	3%	100%
Total	100	100%	

1.4 In terms of Educational Attainment

Table 1.4 the table below illustrates the educational attainment of the respondents from selected public secondary schools in Jolo. Out of the 100 respondents, 20% are college graduates, 31% have completed college with master's units, 32% have earned a master's degree, 8% hold a master's degree with doctoral units, and 9% are doctoral graduates. This suggests that the majority of the respondents are pursuing or have completed graduate studies.

Table 1.4 Demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of educational attainment.

Educational Attainment	Number of Respondents	Percent	Cumulative percent
College Graduate	20	20%	20%
College Graduate with Master's Unit	31	31%	51%
Master's Graduate	32	32%	83%
Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	8	8%	91%

Doctoral Graduate	9	9%	100%
Total	100	100%	

1.5 In terms of Status of Employment

Table 1.5 the table below presents the demographic profile of respondents from selected public secondary schools in Jolo, categorized by their status of employment. Out of the 100 respondents, 2% are volunteer teachers, 8% are contractual teachers, and 90% are permanent teachers. This indicates that the majority of the respondents are permanent employees in the selected public secondary schools in Jolo.

Table 1.5 Demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of status of employment.

Status of Employment	Number of Respondents	Percent	Cumulative percent
Volunteer	2	2%	2%
Contractual	8	8%	10%
Permanent	90	90%	100%
Total	100	100%	

1.6 In terms of Length of Service

Table 1.6 the table below presents the demographic profile of respondents from selected public secondary schools in Jolo, categorized by their length of service. Out of 100 respondents, 29% have served for 5 years or less, 28% have served for 6-10 years, 29% have served for 11-20 years, 9% have served for 21-30 years, and 5% have served for 31 years or more. This indicates that the majority of the respondents have been serving in their teaching positions for a considerable number of years.

Table 1. 6 Demographic profiles of the respondents in terms of length of service.

Length of Service	Number of Respondents	Percent	Cumulative percent
5 years and below	29	29%	29%
6 to 10 years	28	28%	57%
11 to 20 years	29	29%	86%
21 to 30 years	9	9%	95%
31 years and above	5	5%	100%
Total	100	100%	

2. What is the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of: Access to Education; Curriculum Inclusivity; and School Environment?

2.1 In terms of Access to Education

Table 2. 1 the table reflects the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality, as perceived by teachers in terms of access to education. The respondents, in general, obtained a composite mean score of 3.887 with a standard deviation of 0.56705, which is categorized as “agree” in the access to education category.

Specifically, the following statements received high mean scores: Item number five, with a mean of 4.33 and a standard deviation of 0.667, which is rated as “agree,” states, “Students from different backgrounds have the same chance to participate in extracurricular activities.”

Item number three earned a mean of 4.17 with a standard deviation of 0.682, also rated as “agree,” and states, “Educational opportunities are equally available to students regardless of their socio-economic status.” Additionally, item number six received a mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 0.6725, rated as “agree,” and states, “The school ensures that students with disabilities have access to appropriate educational resources.”

Salazar (2016) highlighted that poverty, transportation challenges, and inadequate educational resources disproportionately affect marginalized communities, thus perpetuating social inequality. He emphasized the need for targeted interventions, such as government subsidies and infrastructure improvements, to bridge the gap in access to education.

Similarly, David & Mendoza (2019) argued that addressing these disparities requires systemic reforms, such as equalizing public school funding and implementing policies that prioritize disadvantaged students.

Moreover, Cruz (2020) found that students from low-income families are more likely to drop out of school due to the additional costs associated with education. He called for more comprehensive support systems to ensure sustained access to education, thereby combating social inequality.

Table 2. 1 Extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality as perceived by teachers in terms of access to education.

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	All students have equal access to educational materials and resources in my school.	3.89	.840	Agree
2	The school provides necessary support for students from disadvantaged backgrounds.	3.87	.761	Agree
3	Educational opportunities are equally available to students regardless of their socio-economic status.	4.17	.682	Agree
4	There are programs in place to help students who face barriers to accessing education.	3.89	.815	Agree
5	Students from different backgrounds have the same chance to participate in extracurricular activities.	4.33	.667	Agree
6	The school ensures that students with disabilities have access to appropriate educational resources.	4.00	.725	Agree
7	Scholarships and financial aid are available to help all students succeed.	3.74	.939	Agree
8	The school provides resources for non-native English speakers to support their learning.	3.81	.825	Agree
9	Transportation and other logistical supports are available to all students who need them.	3.32	1.062	Moderately Agree
10	The school regularly assesses and addresses gaps in access to educational opportunities.	3.85	.833	Agree
Weighted Mean		3.887	.56705	Agree

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

2.2 In terms of Curriculum Inclusivity

Table 2.2 the table below illustrates the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality as perceived by teachers, specifically in terms of curriculum inclusivity. The respondents obtained a composite mean score of 4.121 with a standard deviation of .53206, which is rated as “agree” in the curriculum inclusivity category.

Among the statements, item number three received the highest mean score of 4.30 with a standard deviation of .569, which is rated as “agree.” This statement asserts, “The school promotes awareness and understanding of social issues through the curriculum.” Statement number eight, with a mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of .687, was also rated as “agree,” stating, “Inclusive teaching practices are used to ensure all students are engaged.” Additionally, statement number nine, also with a mean of 4.18 and a standard deviation of .657, states, “The curriculum includes examples of successful individuals from diverse backgrounds.” Statement number four received a mean of 4.15 with a standard deviation of .687, which is rated as “agree,” and asserts, “Teaching materials are free from bias and stereotypes.” Statement number ten, with a mean of 4.13 and a standard deviation of .691, states, “Feedback from students is used to improve the inclusivity of the curriculum.” Lastly, statement number two, with a mean of 4.17 and a standard deviation of .656, states, “Lessons incorporate materials that represent different cultures and viewpoints.”

Supporting these findings, Delos Reyes (2017) emphasized that when students' cultural heritage is reflected in their education, they are more likely to feel a sense of belonging and perform better academically. This highlights the importance of culturally responsive curricula in diverse societies like the Philippines.

Furthermore, Bautista (2017) noted that students from disadvantaged backgrounds often struggle with the demands of the new curriculum and suggested that targeted interventions are necessary to support these students.

In addition, Manzano (2018) found that when indigenous knowledge and practices are incorporated into the school curriculum, students from these communities are more engaged and perform better academically, reinforcing the role of inclusive education in promoting social equality by recognizing diverse cultural backgrounds.

Table 2.2 Extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality as perceived by teachers in terms of curriculum inclusivity.

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The curriculum reflects diverse perspectives and backgrounds.	4.09	.698	Agree
2	Lessons incorporate materials that represent different cultures and viewpoints.	4.12	.656	Agree
3	The school promotes awareness and understanding of social issues through the curriculum.	4.20	.569	Agree
4	Teaching materials are free from bias and stereotypes.	4.15	.687	Agree
5	Students learn about the contributions of different groups to society.	4.03	.731	Agree
6	The curriculum addresses social justice and equality issues.	4.05	.687	Agree
7	There are opportunities for students to explore topics related to social equality.	4.08	.692	Agree
8	Inclusive teaching practices are used to ensure all students are engaged.	4.18	.687	Agree
9	The curriculum includes examples of successful individuals from diverse backgrounds.	4.18	.657	Agree
10	Feedback from students is used to improve the inclusivity of the curriculum.	4.13	.691	Agree
Weighted Mean		4.121	.53206	Agree

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

2.3 In terms of School Environment

Table 2.3 the table below illustrates the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality as perceived by teachers, specifically in terms of the school environment. The respondents obtained a composite mean score of 4.140 with a standard deviation of .57997, which is rated as “agree” in the school environment category.

Among the statements, item number two garnered the highest mean score of 4.26 with a standard deviation of .719, which is rated as “agree.” This statement asserts, “The school culture promotes respect and understanding among students from different backgrounds.” Statement number one also received a high mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of .660, which is rated as “agree,” and states, “The school environment fosters a sense of belonging for all students.” Additionally, statement number four earned a mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of .705, rated as “agree,” and asserts, “The school actively works to prevent and address incidents of discrimination and bias.”

Supporting these findings, Villegas (2018) reported that overcrowded classrooms and insufficient resources undermine efforts to provide quality education, urging policy reforms such as reducing class sizes and increasing funding for educational materials to address these challenges.

Moreover, Mercado (2020) highlighted the crucial role of school administrators in promoting inclusive school environments. The study noted that leadership which prioritizes inclusivity and equity fosters settings that support all students and recommended enhanced training for school administrators on promoting social equality within their schools.

Furthermore, De Guzman (2021) emphasized that safe, supportive, and inclusive school environments are key to enabling students from disadvantaged backgrounds to succeed. He called for increased investment in school infrastructure and teacher training to create equitable learning environments.

Table 2.3 Extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality as perceived by teachers in terms of school environment.

No	Statements	Mean	S.D.	Description
1	The school environment fosters a sense of belonging for all students.	4.22	.660	Agree
2	The school culture promotes respect and understanding among students from different backgrounds.	4.26	.719	Agree
3	Policies and practices support an inclusive and equitable school environment.	4.10	.745	Agree
4	The school actively works to prevent and address incidents of discrimination and bias.	4.22	.705	Agree
5	School events and activities celebrate diversity and inclusion.	4.18	.687	Agree
6	Students feel safe and valued in the school environment.	4.19	.720	Agree
7	The school encourages open dialogue about social equality and related issues.	4.01	.674	Agree
8	The physical and social environment of the school supports diverse learning needs.	4.04	.737	Agree
9	The school provides resources for students to learn about different cultures and social issues.	4.02	.710	Agree
10	Staff and students are involved in creating and maintaining a supportive and inclusive school culture.	4.16	.615	Agree

	Weighted Mean	4.140	.57997	Agree
--	---------------	-------	--------	-------

Legend: (5) 4.50 – 5.00=Strongly Agree; (4) 3.50 – 4.49=Agree; (3) 2.50 – 3.49=Moderately Agree; (2)1.50 – 2.49=Disagree; (1)1.00 – 1.49=Strongly Disagree

3. Is there a significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to their demographic profile in terms of: Gender; Age; Civil Status; Educational Attainment; Status of Employment; and Length of Service?

3.1 By Gender

Table 3.1 the table below presents the differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo, specifically in terms of gender. The overall mean differences and t-values obtained under this category indicate a significant difference.

Murthy & Kayabu (2024) emphasized the importance of equality in promoting an inclusive environment. Similarly, UNESCO (2020) underscored the role of teacher equity as a form of diverse role modeling for students. Ball (2021) also highlighted that providing access alone is insufficient; ensuring the quality of education is critical for supporting students from diverse backgrounds.

Based on these findings, the hypothesis which states, "There is no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to gender," is rejected.

Table 3.1 Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of gender.

VARIABLES	Grouping Gender	Mean	S. D.	Mean Difference	t	Sig.	Description
Access to Education	Male	4.025	.46211	.24643	2.199	.030*	Significant
	Female	3.779	.62018				
Curriculum Inclusivity	Male	4.172	.53325	.09237	.861	.392	Not Significant
	Female	4.080	.53238				
School Environment	Male	4.154	.50965	.02597	.221	.825	Not Significant
	Female	4.129	.63410				

Significance at alpha 0.05

3.2 By Age

Table 3.2 the table below presents the differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo, specifically in terms of age. The overall mean differences and t-values obtained in this category indicate no significant difference.

This contrasts with findings by Rasooli et al. (2023), who argued that age significantly influences how teachers conceptualize education's role in promoting social equality. Similarly, Angara (2015) emphasized the importance of addressing disparities in teacher training and resource allocation to foster social equality in the education system.

Based on these results, the hypothesis which states, "There is no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to age," is accepted.

Table 3.2 Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of age.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Access to Education	Between Groups	1.639	4	.410	1.289	.280	Not
	Within Groups	30.194	95	.318			Significant
	Total	31.833	99				
Curriculum Inclusivity	Between Groups	1.947	4	.487	1.773	.141	Not
	Within Groups	26.079	95	.275			Significant
	Total	28.026	99				
School Environment	Between Groups	2.604	4	.651	2.015	.099	Not
	Within Groups	30.696	95	.323			Significant
	Total	33.300	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

3.3 By Civil Status

Table 3.3 the table below presents the differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo, specifically in terms of civil status. The overall mean differences and t-values obtained in this category indicate a significant difference.

Murthy & Kayabu (2024) noted that teachers with family responsibilities might face challenges in their professional development activities, as compared to unmarried teachers who often have more flexibility regarding workload and job transfers. This could influence their perspectives on promoting social equality, as the time and effort required to fulfill such responsibilities may impact how they approach this goal.

Based on these findings, the hypothesis which states, "There is no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to civil status," is rejected.

Table 3.3 Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of civil status.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Access to Education	Between Groups	4.798	2	2.399	8.608	.000*	
	Within Groups	27.035	97	.279			Significant
	Total	31.833	99				
Curriculum Inclusivity	Between Groups	1.973	2	.986	3.673	.029*	
	Within Groups	26.053	97	.269			Significant
	Total	28.026	99				
School Environment	Between Groups	2.873	2	1.437	4.580	.013*	
	Within Groups	30.427	97	.314			Significant
	Total	33.300	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

Post-hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD Test was conducted to determine which groups, classified according to civil status, had different levels of means in the areas related to the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo.

The result of the analysis, presented in Table 3.3.1, reveals that the differences in the means of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality were observed by subtracting the lower group mean from the higher group mean.

a) On access to education category, it shows that single group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.46018^*$ with a standard error of $.11314$ and a p value of $.000$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the married group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under access to education category than those married group.

b) On curriculum inclusivity category, it shows that single group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.29598^*$ with a standard error of $.11107$ and a p value of $.024$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the married group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under curriculum inclusivity category than those married group.

c) On school environment category, it shows that single group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.31922^*$ with a standard error of $.12003$ and a p value of $.027$, which is

significant at alpha =.05 over the married group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under school environment category than those married group.

Table 3.3.1 Post Hoc Analysis: Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of civil status.

Dependent Variable	(I) Grouping Civil Status	(J) Grouping Civil Status	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
(a) Access to Education	Single	Married	-.46018*	.11314	.000
		Widowed/Separated	-.55758	.31835	.192
	Married	Single	.46018*	.11314	.000
		Widowed/Separated	-.09740	.31186	.948
	Widowed/Separated	Single	.55758	.31835	.192
		Married	.09740	.31186	.948
(b) Curriculum Inclusivity	Single	Married	-.29598*	.11107	.024
		Widowed/Separated	-.34545	.31252	.513
	Married	Single	.29598*	.11107	.024
		Widowed/Separated	-.04948	.30615	.986
	Widowed/Separated	Single	.34545	.31252	.513
		Married	.04948	.30615	.986
(c) School Environment	Single	Married	-.31922*	.12003	.025
		Widowed/Separated	-.68485	.33773	.111
	Married	Single	.31922*	.12003	.025
		Widowed/Separated	-.36562	.33085	.513
	Widowed/Separated	Single	.68485	.33773	.111
		Married	.36562	.33085	.513

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

3.4 By Educational Attainment

Table 3.4 the table shows the difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of educational attainment. It can be observed that the overall mean differences and t-values obtained in this category indicate a significant difference.

Chesters & Haynes (2016) found an association between educational attainment and social origin, highlighting the impact of educational outcomes on social class equality. Furthermore, Rasooli et al. (2022) indicated that teachers' educational backgrounds play a crucial role in their ability to recognize and address equity issues in education. Their study revealed that teachers with diverse educational qualifications conceptualize and approach social equality in different ways. Thus, educational attainment is a critical factor influencing teachers' philosophical perspectives on promoting social equality through education.

Therefore, the hypothesis stating that “There is no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to educational attainment” is rejected. Table 3.4 Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of educational attainment.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Access to Education	Between Groups	3.390	4	.848	2.831	.029*	
	Within Groups	28.443	95	.299			Significant
	Total	31.833	99				
Curriculum Inclusivity	Between Groups	1.754	4	.438	1.585	.185	Not
	Within Groups	26.272	95	.277			Significant
	Total	28.026	99				
School Environment	Between Groups	2.021	4	.505	1.535	.198	Not
	Within Groups	31.279	95	.329			Significant
	Total	33.300	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

A post-hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD Test was conducted to identify which groups, classified by civil status, exhibited different mean levels in areas related to the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo.

The results of this analysis, presented in Table 3.4.1, reveal that the difference in means for the assessment of education's role in promoting social equality is calculated by subtracting the lower group mean from the higher group mean.

a) On access to education category, it shows that college graduate with master's unit group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.34083^*$ with a standard error of $.13789$ and a p value of $.006$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the master's graduate group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under access to education category than those master's graduate group.

b) On curriculum inclusivity category, it shows that no groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under curriculum inclusivity category.

c) On school environment category, it shows that no groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under school environment category.

Table 3.4.1 Post Hoc Analysis: Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of educational attainment.

Dependent Variable	(I) Grouping Educational Attainment	(J) Grouping Educational Attainment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
(a) Access to Education	College Graduate	College Graduate with Master's Unit	.04645	.15693	.998
		Master's Graduate	-.29437	.15597	.331
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	-.33500	.22890	.589
		Doctoral Graduate	-.44889	.21963	.253
	College Graduate with Master's Unit	College Graduate	-.04645	.15693	.998
		Master's Graduate	-.34083*	.13789	.006
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	-.38145	.21699	.404
		Doctoral Graduate	-.49534	.20718	.127
	Master's Graduate	College Graduate	.29437	.15597	.331
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	.34083*	.13789	.006
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	-.04062	.21629	1.000
		Doctoral Graduate	-.15451	.20645	.944
	Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	College Graduate	.33500	.22890	.589
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	.38145	.21699	.404
		Master's Graduate	.04062	.21629	1.000
		Doctoral Graduate	-.11389	.26588	.993
	Doctoral Graduate	College Graduate	.44889	.21963	.253
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	.49534	.20718	.127
		Master's Graduate	.15451	.20645	.944
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.11389	.26588	.993
(b) Curriculum Inclusivity	College Graduate	College Graduate with Master's Unit	.04597	.15083	.998
		Master's Graduate	-.19375	.14990	.696
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.22500	.21999	.844
		Doctoral Graduate	-.18056	.21108	.912
	College Graduate with Master's Unit	College Graduate	-.04597	.15083	.998
		Master's Graduate	-.23972	.13253	.375
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.17903	.20854	.911
		Doctoral Graduate	-.22652	.19912	.786
	Master's Graduate	College Graduate	.19375	.14990	.696
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	.23972	.13253	.375
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.41875	.20787	.267
		Doctoral Graduate	.01319	.19842	1.000
	Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	College Graduate	-.22500	.21999	.844
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	-.17903	.20854	.911
		Master's Graduate	-.41875	.20787	.267
		Doctoral Graduate	-.40556	.25553	.509

Dependent Variable	(I) Grouping Educational Attainment	(J) Grouping Educational Attainment	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
	Doctoral Graduate	College Graduate	.18056	.21108	.912
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	.22652	.19912	.786
		Master's Graduate	-.01319	.19842	1.000
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.40556	.25553	.509
(c) School Environment	College Graduate	College Graduate with Master's Unit	.11710	.16457	.953
		Master's Graduate	-.16063	.16356	.863
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.25500	.24004	.825
		Doctoral Graduate	-.17000	.23032	.947
	College Graduate with Master's Unit	College Graduate	-.11710	.16457	.953
		Master's Graduate	-.27772	.14460	.314
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.13790	.22755	.974
		Doctoral Graduate	-.28710	.21727	.679
	Master's Graduate	College Graduate	.16063	.16356	.863
		College Graduate with Master's Unit	.27772	.14460	.314
		Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.41562	.22682	.361
		Doctoral Graduate	-.00938	.21650	1.000
Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	College Graduate	-.25500	.24004	.825	
	College Graduate with Master's Unit	-.13790	.22755	.974	
	Master's Graduate	-.41562	.22682	.361	
	Doctoral Graduate	-.42500	.27882	.549	
Doctoral Graduate	College Graduate	.17000	.23032	.947	
	College Graduate with Master's Unit	.28710	.21727	.679	
	Master's Graduate	.00938	.21650	1.000	
	Master's Graduate with Doctoral Unit	.42500	.27882	.549	

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

3.5 By Status of Employment

Table 3.5 the table shows the difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of employment status. From this table, it can be seen that, generally, the overall mean differences and t-values indicate no significant difference in this category.

In contrast, Romano (2023) found that teachers' willingness to implement equity-focused assessment practices is influenced by their job security and professional positioning. He suggested that teachers with permanent positions are more likely to take pedagogical risks and innovate, thereby reflecting their commitment to social equality in their teaching practices.

Therefore, the hypothesis, which states that "There is no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to employment status," is accepted.

Table 3.5 Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of status of employment.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Access to Education	Between Groups	.550	2	.275	.853	.429	Not
	Within Groups	31.283	97	.323			Significant
	Total	31.833	99				
Curriculum Inclusivity	Between Groups	.245	2	.122	.428	.653	Not
	Within Groups	27.781	97	.286			Significant
	Total	28.026	99				
School Environment	Between Groups	1.480	2	.740	2.257	.110	Not
	Within Groups	31.820	97	.328			Significant
	Total	33.300	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

3.6 By Length of Service

Table 3.6 the table shows the difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of length of service. It can be seen that, generally, the overall mean differences and t-values indicate a significant difference in this category.

This finding supports the study by Rasooli et al. (2023), which found that early-career teachers often have different perspectives on educational equity compared to mid-career and veteran educators. These differences reflect generational shifts in teacher education programs, the accumulated impact of professional experience, and the evolution of teachers' pedagogical philosophies over time.

Therefore, the hypothesis, which states that "There is no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo when data are grouped according to length of service," is rejected.

Table 3.6 Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of length of service.

SOURCES OF VARIATION		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Description
Access to Education	Between Groups	5.655	4	1.414	5.131	.001*	
	Within Groups	26.178	95	.276			Significant
	Total	31.833	99				
Curriculum Inclusivity	Between Groups	3.118	4	.779	2.973	.023*	
	Within Groups	24.908	95	.262			Significant
	Total	28.026	99				
School Environment	Between Groups	3.469	4	.867	2.762	.032*	
	Within Groups	29.831	95	.314			Significant
	Total	33.300	99				

Significance at alpha 0.05

A post-hoc analysis using the Tukey HSD Test was conducted to identify which groups, classified according to length of service, showed significant differences in the mean scores for the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo.

The results of the analysis, as shown in Table 3.6.1, indicate that the differences in means between groups were determined by subtracting a lower group mean from a higher group mean.

a) On access to education category, it shows that 5 years and below group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.39089^*$ with a standard error of $.13908$ and a p value of $.046$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the 6-10 years group. It also shows that 5 years and below group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.50000^*$ with a standard error of $.13785$ and a p value of $.004$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the 11-20 years group. Additionally, it shows that 5 years and below group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.83517^*$ with a standard error of $.25419$ and a p value of $.012$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the 31 years and above group. So, under this sub-category, no other groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under access to education category than those 6-20 years, and 31 years and above groups respectively.

b) On curriculum inclusivity category, it shows that 5 years and below group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.68552^*$ with a standard error of $.24795$ and a p value of $.050$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the 31 years and above group. So, under this sub-category, no groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under curriculum inclusivity category than those 31 years and above group.

c) On school environment category, it shows that 5 years and below group of respondents obtained a mean difference of $-.70276^*$ with a standard error of $.27135$ and a p value of $.040$, which is significant at $\alpha = .05$ over the 31 years and above group. So, under this sub-category, no groups of respondents are supposed to have a better way of perceiving the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo under school environment category than those 31 years and above group.

Table 3.6.1 Post Hoc Analysis: Differences in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of length of service.

Dependent Variable	(I) Grouping Length of Service	(J) Grouping Length of Service	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
(a) Access to Education	5 years and below	6-10 years	-.39089*	.13908	.046
		11-20 years	-.50000*	.13785	.004
		21-30 years	-.51073	.20030	.088
		31 years and above	-.83517*	.25419	.012
	6-10 years	5 years and below	.39089*	.13908	.046
		11-20 years	-.10911	.13908	.935
		21-30 years	-.11984	.20114	.975
		31 years and above	-.44429	.25486	.413
	11-20 years	5 years and below	.50000*	.13785	.004
		6-10 years	.10911	.13908	.935
		21-30 years	-.01073	.20030	1.000
		31 years and above	-.33517	.25419	.680
	21-30 years	5 years and below	.51073	.20030	.088
		6-10 years	.11984	.20114	.975
		11-20 years	.01073	.20030	1.000
		31 years and above	-.32444	.29280	.802
	31 years and above	5 years and below	.83517*	.25419	.012
		6-10 years	.44429	.25486	.413
		11-20 years	.33517	.25419	.680
		21-30 years	.32444	.29280	.802
(b) Curriculum Inclusivity	5 years and below	6-10 years	-.21909	.13567	.492
		11-20 years	-.16207	.13447	.748
		21-30 years	-.48774	.19538	.100
		31 years and above	-.68552*	.24795	.050
	6-10 years	5 years and below	.21909	.13567	.492
		11-20 years	.05702	.13567	.993
		21-30 years	-.26865	.19621	.649
		31 years and above	-.46643	.24860	.337
	11-20 years	5 years and below	.16207	.13447	.748
		6-10 years	-.05702	.13567	.993
		21-30 years	-.32567	.19538	.459
		31 years and above	-.52345	.24795	.224
	21-30 years	5 years and below	.48774	.19538	.100
		6-10 years	.26865	.19621	.649
		11-20 years	.32567	.19538	.459
		31 years and above	-.19778	.28561	.958
	31 years and above	5 years and below	.68552*	.24795	.050
		6-10 years	.46643	.24860	.337
		11-20 years	.52345	.24795	.224

Dependent Variable	(I) Grouping Length of Service	(J) Grouping Length of Service	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
(c) School Environment	5 years and below	21-30 years	.19778	.28561	.958
		6-10 years	-.26133	.14847	.403
		11-20 years	-.23103	.14716	.520
		21-30 years	-.52720	.21382	.107
	6-10 years	31 years and above	-.70276*	.27135	.040
		5 years and below	.26133	.14847	.403
		11-20 years	.03030	.14847	1.000
		21-30 years	-.26587	.21472	.729
	11-20 years	31 years and above	-.44143	.27206	.487
		5 years and below	.23103	.14716	.520
		6-10 years	-.03030	.14847	1.000
		21-30 years	-.29617	.21382	.639
	21-30 years	31 years and above	-.47172	.27135	.416
		5 years and below	.52720	.21382	.107
		6-10 years	.26587	.21472	.729
		11-20 years	.29617	.21382	.639
	31 years and above	31 years and above	-.17556	.31256	.980
		5 years and below	.70276*	.27135	.040
		6-10 years	.44143	.27206	.487
		11-20 years	.47172	.27135	.416
		21-30 years	.17556	.31256	.980

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

4. Is there a significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of access to education, curriculum inclusivity and school environment?

4.1 Correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo

Table 4.1 presents the correlation among the sub-categories under the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo. It is evident from the table that there is a very high positive and significant correlation between curriculum inclusivity and school environment ($r = .744$; $p = .000$). Additionally, there is a high positive and significant correlation between access to education and curriculum inclusivity ($r = .690$; $p = .000$), as well as access to education and school environment ($r = .690$; $p = .000$).

These findings indicate a positive and significant correlation among the sub-categories related to the role of education in promoting social equality across the schools studied.

Shoma & Oecotrophologie (2019a) reported that an inclusive curriculum design increases enrollment by addressing diverse needs, which in turn improves access to education. This suggests that a responsive and inclusive curriculum is positively correlated with greater access to education.

Furthermore, Chen et al. (2020) highlighted a bidirectional relationship between inclusive curricula, which require adaptable environments, and innovative spaces that promote equity-focused teaching.

Additionally, Iweka (2017) emphasized that safe, resource-rich environments contribute to improved student attendance, with equitable school environments enhancing access to quality education.

Therefore, the hypothesis stating, "There is no significant correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo in terms of access to education, curriculum inclusivity, and school environment," is hereby rejected.

Table 4.1 Correlation among the sub-categories subsumed under the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality among selected public secondary schools in Jolo.

Variables	Pearson <i>r</i>	Sig.	N	Description
Access to Education				
Curriculum Inclusivity	.690**	.000	100	High
School Environment	.667**	.000	100	High
Curriculum Inclusivity				
School Environment	.744**	.000	100	Very High

Legend: ** Correlation Coefficient is significant at alpha .01 level

Correlation Coefficient Scales Adopted from Hopkins, Will (2002): 0.0-0.1=Nearly Zero; 0.1-0.30=Low; 0.3-0.50=Moderate; 0.5-0.7-0=High; 0.7-0.9= Very High; 0.9-1=Nearly Perfect

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Demographic Representation: The respondents from selected public secondary schools in Jolo are sufficiently represented across various demographic categories, including gender, age, civil status, educational attainment, status of employment, and length of service.
2. Understanding of Education’s Role in Social Equality: On average, the respondents express a positive and agreeable understanding of the role of education in promoting social equality within the context of selected public secondary schools in Jolo.
3. Significant Differences: This study found no significant difference in the extent of the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality when data were grouped according to age and status of employment. However, significant differences were observed when the data were grouped according to gender, civil status, educational attainment, and length of service.
4. These findings support Pierre Bourdieu’s Social Reproduction Theory, which asserts that education systems often reinforce existing social inequalities rather than mitigating them. According to Bourdieu (1977), schools tend to perpetuate social structures and inequalities by favoring the cultural capital of dominant social groups, leading to the reproduction of class disparities across generations. In the context of public secondary schools in Jolo, this theory highlights the efforts made by school administrators to combat social inequalities. These efforts include ensuring free access to quality education, developing an inclusive curriculum, and creating supportive school environments.

Despite these efforts, challenges persist, and this study has identified some of the issues that need to be addressed in order to further mitigate social inequalities in education.

5. **Significant Relationships:** The study also found a high positive and significant correlation among the sub-categories related to the assessment of the role of education in promoting social equality across the selected public secondary schools in Jolo. This indicates that curriculum inclusivity, access to education, and a positive school environment are closely interconnected in promoting social equality.

References

- Adalia, H.G., Chavez, J.V., Hayudini, M.A.A., et al. (2025). Relevance of Grammar among Gen Z College Students Using Social Learning Perspectives. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(3), 432–450. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i3.8401>
- Ainscow, T. (2015). *Towards inclusive education: Developing a framework for analysis*. UNESCO.
- Angara, S. (2015). Importance of educational reforms in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Education*, 23(4), 15–29.
- Ball, S. J. (2021). *The education debate* (3rd ed.). Policy Press.
- Baker, T. (2018). Educational inequality and the challenges of access in marginalized communities. *Journal of Education Policy and Development*, 14(2), 45–58.
- Bautista, M. (2017). Implementation of the K-12 curriculum and inclusivity. *Journal of Philippine Educational Policy*, 10(2), 40–55.
- Benavot, A., & Riddle, P. (1988). The expansion of primary education, 1870–1940: Trends and issues. *Sociology of Education*, 61(3), 191–210.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Sage Publications.
- Carandang, S. (2016). Education in conflict-affected areas and social cohesion. *Mindanao Educational Review*, 7(1), 73–88.
- Chavez, J.V. (2020). Academic and Health Insecurities of Indigent Students during Pandemic: Study on Adaptive Strategies under Learning Constraints. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 16(3), 74–81.
- Chavez, J.V. (2023). Assessing Online Academic Integrity and Humanized Teaching in Zamboanga Peninsula Polytechnic State University. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Social Sciences*, 19(1), 9–17.
- Chavez, J.V., & Lamorinas, D.D. (2023). Reconfiguring assessment practices and strategies in online education during the pandemic. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education*, 10(1), 160–174.
- Chavez, J.V., Anuddin, F.O., Mansul, H.H., et al. (2024). Analyzing impacts of campus journalism on student's grammar consciousness and confidence in writing engagements. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(7), 6106. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i7.6106>
- Chavez, J.V., Cuilan, J.T., Mannan, S.S., et al. (2024). Discourse Analysis on the Ethical Dilemmas on the Use of AI in Academic Settings. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 349–363. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6765>
- Chavez, J.V., Gregorio, M.W., Araneta, A.L., & Bihag, C.D. (2024). Magna Carta for women health workers, teachers, and minimum-wage earners in the workplace: Policy awareness and organizational compliance. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1735. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1735>

- Coleman, J. S. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity (Coleman Report). U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- Cruz, L. (2020). Socio-economic barriers to free public education in the Philippines. *Journal of Philippine Social Studies*, 12(3), 121–136.
- David, R., & Mendoza, R. (2019). Historical and socio-economic roots of educational inequality in the Philippines. *Philippine Sociological Review*, 42(1), 67–82.
- De Guzman, J. (2021). School environments and social equality in rural Mindanao. *Journal of Rural Education Studies*, 15(2), 25–39.
- Delos Reyes, C. (2017). Culturally inclusive curriculum development. *Philippine Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 13(4), 101–114.
- Freire, P. (2019). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (50th anniversary ed.). Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Garcia, C.S., Lastam, J.M.P., Chavez, J.V., et al. (2025). Discourse analysis on learners halting their education due to early marriage. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 10(1), 2558. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v10i1.2558>
- Garcia, L. M. (2021). Schools as agents of change: The role of inclusive education in conflict-affected regions. *International Review of Educational Development*, 37(4), 212–227.
- Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Continuum.
- Gonzales, R. (2018). Public schools' role in promoting social equality in the Philippines. *Philippine Education Review*, 29(1), 10–24.
- Johnson, R., & Perkins, M. (2020). Leadership for equity: How school leaders promote inclusion and reduce disparities. *Educational Leadership Review*, 18(1), 33–49.
- Lareau, A. (2011). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life* (2nd ed.). University of California Press.
- Leon, A.J.T.D., Jumalon, R.L., Chavez, J.V., et al. (2024). Analysis on the implementation of inclusive classroom: Perception on compliances and obstructions of selected public-school teachers. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(9), 2537. <https://doi.org/10.59429/esp.v9i9.2537>
- Manzano, V. (2018). Educational experiences of indigenous peoples in Mindanao. *Journal of Indigenous Education*, 11(2), 56–70.
- Mercado, M. (2020). Role of school administrators in promoting inclusive environments. *Philippine Journal of School Leadership*, 19(3), 36–49.
- Murro, R.A., Lobo, J.G., Inso, A.R.C., & Chavez, J.V. (2023). Difficulties of parents with low educational attainment in assisting their children in modular distance learning during pandemic. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 9(1), 1957. <https://doi.org/10.54517/esp.v9i1.1957>
- OECD. (2020). *Equity in education: Breaking down barriers to social mobility*. OECD Publishing.
- Ramos, R. (2019). Gender inclusivity in Philippine public schools. *Journal of Gender and Education*, 16(2), 14–29.
- Rasooli, M., Zareian, G., & Bozorgian, H. (2022). Teachers' educational backgrounds and perspectives on equity. (As cited in the original narrative context.)
- Reyes, M., & Flores, J. (2021). Community engagement and social equality in schools. *Philippine Community Education Journal*, 25(1), 50–64.
- Romano, E. (2023). Teacher equity, job security, and pedagogical innovation. (As cited in the original context.)
- Salazar, J. (2016). Geographical and economic barriers to quality education in rural Philippines. *Journal of Rural Education and Development*, 21(3), 33–47.

- Santos, T. (2020). Digital divide and access to education during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Technology and Education*, 30(4), 88–102.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Shoma, A., & Oecotrophologie, U. (2019a). Inclusive curriculum design and access to education. (As cited in the narrative.)
- UNESCO. (2019). *Global education monitoring report 2019: Migration, displacement and education – Building bridges, not walls*. UNESCO Publishing. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000265866>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Inclusion and education: All means all – Global education monitoring report*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Villegas, A. (2018). Challenges in promoting inclusivity in public secondary schools. *Philippine Journal of Educational Challenges*, 14(2), 75–89.
- World Bank. (2018). *World development report 2018: Learning to realize education’s promise*. World Bank Publications.
- World Bank. (2020). *The COVID-19 pandemic: Shocks to education and policy responses*. World Bank Group. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/33696>