

Promotion of Gender Equality in Land Access and Security of Land Tenure in the Philippines

Eugeneliza A. Garcia, Ma. Rowena G. Salinda
Agrarian Reform Program Officer II,
Department of Agrarian Reform

Chester Paul D. Torio
Development Management Officer III,
Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Bernardino P. Malang, DIT, Ph.D, Florinda G. Vigonte, Ph.D
Faculty, World City College, Cubao, Quezon City, Philippines
Faculty, Bulacan State University, Bustos Campus, Philippines

Abstract:- This study aims to assess and evaluate the gender responsiveness of the existing policies and guidelines on the promotion of gender equality in land access and land security in the Philippines, using the adopted Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) of the UN-HABITAT and the six (6) Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC) namely: (1) Participation of women and men; (2) Capacity development and empowerment of women; (3) Legal and institutional considerations to ensure equality of land access and land tenure security; (4) social and cultural considerations; (5) economic considerations; and (6) scale, coordination, and sustainability. Purposive sampling was used, with respondents drawn from key government agencies, including the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), the Land Registration Authority (LRA), the Housing and Urban Development Council (HUDCC), the National Housing Authority (NHA), and the Local Government Unit (LGU) of Bocaue, Bulacan. This study used a quantitative research approach designed through an online questionnaire sent to respondents to collect essential data. The outcome of this study shows that the majority of selected informants agreed that the existing policies and land tools in the Philippines promote gender equality in terms of land access and security of land tenure, with a 4.03 average mean in the conducted survey using the six (6) GEC.

Keywords:- Gender, Land Tools, Land Security, Gender Evaluation Criteria, Empowerment, Philippines.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) states that gender equality is the condition in which men and women have the same rights. This includes increasing women's visibility and participation in areas where they have traditionally been excluded or discriminated against, such as land governance systems and structures. Gender equality, according to UNICEF, "means that both women and men have the same rights, resources, opportunities, and protections."

Gender disparities in land tenure must be addressed if land objectives such as enhancing land productivity, providing affordable housing, and supporting sustainable resource management are to be realized. Land tenure policy frameworks that address gender-inclusive access to land are

required. Without special consideration for gender inclusion, significant portions of society may be excluded from the advantages of land administration, management, and development projects. This is supported by the Women's Summit findings, which show that in most modern cultures, there are significant gender disparities in access to land, housing, and basic infrastructure. Finally, as stated by the United Nations (UN) Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) Commission on the Status of Women, "land rights discrimination is a violation of human rights."

Land access is a critical issue because it is a requirement for food production and a factor in shelter and community development. People's livelihoods and security are directly affected by how access issues are addressed in development projects, not just in rural areas but also in urban and peri-urban settings. Failure to address all stakeholders' land tenure interests in land development or land reform can result in problems and inequities. These issues may unintentionally affect society's most vulnerable and disadvantaged members. As a result, land administration professionals must be aware of gender equality regarding land access.

II. METHODS

A. Research Design

This study used the descriptive survey method of research. This method aims to measure variables or sets of variables as they exist naturally (Calderon, 1993). Calderon also mentioned that it is concerned with describing an individual variable. According to Gravetter (2009), survey research design seeks to obtain an accurate picture of the people being studied. Gravetter (2009) added that the survey research design's defining element is that the survey results are used to describe the variables being studied. The said method will be employed in this study to assess the gender responsiveness of policies and processes for the disposition and registration of land tenure instruments of the subject under investigation.

B. Population and Sampling

The intended audience and users are Land Administration and Management (LAM) duty bearers (e.g., policymakers, managers, and implementers of land administration projects and services at the national and local levels – line agencies and local government units). The researchers used purposive sampling in order to take a sample quantitatively. According to Dornyei (2007),

purposeful sampling is a technique to find individuals who can provide rich and varied insights into the phenomenon under investigation to maximize what we can learn.

C. Respondents of the Study

The respondents of this study came from five land administration and management (LAM) agencies and one local government unit (LGU).

The five LAM agencies were the: (i) Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR); (ii) Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR); (iii) Housing and Urban Development Council (HUDCC); and (iv) Land Registration Authority (LRA), (v) National Housing Authority (NHA). The one (vi) LGU was Bocaue, Bulacan.

D. Research Instrument

A survey questionnaire was utilized to collect the required data. The Gender Evaluation Criteria (GEC), a gender assessment framework and methodology created by the Global Land Tool Network (GLTN) of UNHABITAT (written permission was secured first from the appropriate authority), were utilized in this study. The GEC is a set of six criteria and 22 questions used to examine the gender responsiveness of land tools. Laws, policies, governance structures, plans, guidelines, operational manuals, training modules, land tenure instruments, land records databases, monitoring and evaluation instruments, and anything else that influences the State and management of land tenure, land use, and land values are all considered land tools by GLTN.

E. Ethical Considerations

The researchers strictly observed Republic Act (RA.) No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act (DPA) of 2012. The Data Privacy Act (DPA) is a law that aims to protect all types of information, whether private, personal, or sensitive. It is intended to apply to natural and juridical persons processing personal data. Thus, the identity of any subject was never compromised during or after the data-gathering procedure.

F. Data Gathering Procedure

A survey questionnaire was utilized to collect the essential information. The survey questionnaire form is mainly adapted from the GEC developed by the GLTN of the UN-HABITAT. The researcher distributed the completed and approved questionnaire to respondents of the various agencies' land tools. The questionnaire was provided to the respondents, along with permission to conduct the study. The researchers distributed Google Form surveys to

respondents from several national government departments as part of the research.

The GEC's 22 questions contain particular indicators that signify variables that must be present for a land administration and management policy or method to be gender-responsive. Many of the questions include more than one indicator. Quantitative data were gathered to evaluate each indicator. The quantitative data were rated on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 representing strongly agree or fully present and 1 representing strongly disagree or none. The average rating for all indicators under such a question was computed to determine the response to a question.

The questionnaire employed in this case was a rating scale questionnaire, and the researchers collected information from participants using the Likert scale. The Likert scale is a psychometric response scale often used in questionnaires to measure participants' preferences or levels of agreement with a statement or set of assertions. Likert scales are a unidimensional, non-comparative scaling technique (measures only one trait). Respondents are asked to use an ordinal scale to rate their level of agreement.

In keeping with the participatory aspect of the gender assessment and the adaptability of the data-collection instrument, participants were instructed to select only the GEC themes, questions, and indicators that they thought would apply to their respective land tools. As a result, not all of them answered all the questions on the instrument.

The data was tallied and collated when the surveys were completed.

G. Statistical Treatment of Data

Purposive sampling was used for respondents who met the researcher's criteria to determine respondents' perceptions of the extent to which land administration and management policies, procedures, and practices of national government agencies and local government units are gender-responsive.

The respondent's perceptions were computerized and processed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel. For the interpretation of the extent to which land administration and management policies, procedures, and practices of national government agencies and local government units are gender-responsive, Likert's five-point scale with their mean ranges and descriptive interpretation were used.

Likert's Scale.

| Scale | Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
|-------|-------------|----------------------------|
| 5 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| 4 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| 3 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| 2 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| 1 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This chapter outlines the researchers' presentation of the study's results, analysis, and interpretation of the data.

SOP No.1: Do existing policies in land access promote equal participation of women and men and gender-responsive governance?

The result implied that land tools promote equal participation of women and men in gender-responsive governance in land access and maximize the involvement of both sexes, as evidenced by the result of a 4.03 weighted mean. The highest mean of 4.29 for questions number five (5) and eight (8) supported the result, while the lowest mean of 3.86 for questions number three (3), four (4), and six (6).

| Criterion 1 | Weighted Mean | Standard.D eviation | Descriptive Equivalent | Rank |
|---|---------------|---------------------|------------------------|------|
| 1. Requirements to ensure gender responsiveness of land access and tenure security and to orient/train management and other key actors on gender concerns are explicit in the tool. | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 3 |
| 2. Management and key implementers are oriented and trained on gender concerns. | 4.00 | 1.000 | Agree | 3 |
| 3. Presence of gender focal person/team. | 3.86 | 1.069 | Agree | 4 |
| 4. Proportion of women and men in the development and implementation of the tool is within 40% to 60%. | 3.86 | .900 | Agree | 4 |
| 5. Men and women in the communities participated in the development and implementation of the tool. | 4.29 | .488 | Agree | 1 |
| 6. Presence of affirmative action/s that will address gender imbalance, if any. | 3.86 | 1.069 | Agree | 4 |
| 7. Sex-disaggregated statistics (e.g., applicants, claimants, participants, staff, etc.) are collected continuously. | 4.14 | .690 | Agree | 2 |
| 8. Analysis of sex-disaggregated statistics is included in the reports and considered during planning. | 4.29 | .756 | Agree | 1 |
| 9. Conduct of assessment of the outcome/impact of the tool on women and men is explicit in the tool | 4.14 | .378 | Agree | 2 |
| 10. Situation of women has improved since the approval/implementation of the tool. | 3.86 | .378 | Agree | 4 |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.03 | | Agree | |

| Legend: | Scale Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|
| 6 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| 5 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| 4 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| 3 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| 2 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

Table 1: Equal Participation of Women and Men and Gender-Responsive Governance

SOP No. 2: Do government authorities in land access promote capacity development in the organization and empowerment of women and men to use, access, and benefit from the tool?

Criterion 2 shows that existing land tools promote capacity development, organization, and empowerment of Women and Men to use, access, and benefit from the tool. It also implies that the key Agencies (DAR, DENR, LRA,

HUDCC, and LGUs) allotted funds for promoting capacity building on the gender-responsive approach for both Women and Men, with the result of 4.03 as the weighted mean. The highest mean of 4.29 for question number four (4) supported the result, while questions number one (1) and five (5) obtained the same mean of 3.86.

| Criterion 2 | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Descriptive Equivalent | Rank |
|--|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|
| 1. Presence of funds for the development of capacity to ensure gender responsiveness of land tool | 3.86 | .378 | Agree | 4 |
| 2. Intended financial resources are used for the development of capacity to ensure gender responsiveness of land tool | 4.00 | .816 | Agree | 3 |
| 3. Presence of means to inform women and men on the land tool | 4.14 | .690 | Agree | 2 |
| 4. Women and men in concerned communities/sectors and service groups (GOs and NGOs) know their rights and responsibilities related to the tool. | 4.29 | .756 | Agree | 1 |
| 5. Presence of mechanisms for assessment of tool by female and male stakeholders (focus of assessment will include the impact of the land tool on women, men, children, and the environment) | 3.86 | .378 | Agree | 4 |
| Average Weighted Mean | 4.03 | | Agree | |

| Legend: | Scale | Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
|---------|-------|-------------|----------------------------|
| | 5 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| | 4 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| | 3 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| | 2 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| | 1 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

Table 2: Capacity Development, Organization, and Empowerment of Women and Men to Use, Access, and Benefit from the Tool

SOP No. 3.: Does the tool promote legal, and institutional considerations in regard to women's and men's access to land?

The findings demonstrated that in criterion 3, the majority of the selected respondents having a weighted mean of 3.93, agreed that the existing land tools promote

legal and institutional considerations in regard to women's and men's access to land. One of the supporting indicators is the highest mean of 4.14 from question number seven (7). On the other hand, question number two (2) obtained the lowest mean of 3.57.

| Criterion 3 | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Descriptive Equivalent | Rank |
|--|---------------|--------------------|------------------------|------|
| 1. Presence of mechanisms (e.g., policy, manual of operations, trained people, budget, monitoring, and evaluation tool, nature of land tenure instruments, etc.) to ensure equality of rights of qualified women and men to land access and tenure security. | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 2 |
| 2. Increased proportion of women holding land tenure instruments. | 3.57 | .535 | Agree | 4 |
| 3. Presence of a mechanism to identify conflicting claims and interests to the land, and assess their impact on women and men. | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 2 |
| 4. Presence of alternative mechanisms (to judicial means) for gender-sensitive resolution of land conflicts. | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 2 |
| 5. Proportion of women to men facilitators of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. | 3.86 | .378 | Agree | 3 |
| 6. Presence of statements that recognized different rights (e.g., titleholders, leaseholders, tenants, workers, etc.) to a same parcel of land | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 2 |
| 7. Presence of mechanisms (e.g., land tenure instrument) recognizing different rights (e.g., titleholders, leaseholders, tenants, workers, etc.) to the same parcel of land | 4.14 | .378 | Agree | 1 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Average Weighted Mean | | 3.93 | Agree |
| Legend: | Scale | Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
| | 5 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| | 4 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| | 3 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| | 2 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| | 1 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

Table 3: Legal and Institutional Considerations in Regard to Women and Men’s Access to Land

SOP No. 4: Does the tool promote Social and Cultural considerations concerning women's and men's access to land?

promotion of Social and Cultural considerations regarding women's and men's access to land have been present and applied through existing land tools. In this criterion, question number one (1) has the highest mean of 3.71 and the lowest mean of 3.57 for question number two (2).

Criterion 4 weighted mean result of 3.64 indicated that the majority of selected participants agreed that the

| Criterion 4 | | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Descriptive Equivalent | Rank |
|------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Presence of mechanisms to assess statutory and customary laws and practices affecting women ‘s land rights. | 3.71 | .756 | Agree | 1 |
| 2. | Proportion of women to men beneficiaries of the land tool who claim to have benefited from the land tool –(40% to 60% of them are women/men) | 3.57 | .976 | Agree | 2 |
| Average Weighted Mean | | 3.64 | | Agree | |

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Legend: | Scale | Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
| | 5 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| | 4 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| | 3 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| | 2 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| | 1 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

Table 4. Social and Cultural Considerations in Regard to Women’s and Men’s Access to Land

SOP No. 5: Does the tool promote economic considerations regarding women's and men's access to land?

Considerations concerning Women's and Men's land Access. In the given criteria, question number one (1) gathered the highest mean score of 4.29 while the lowest mean of 3.83 for question four (4).

The findings show that in criterion 5, selected respondents obtained a weighted mean of 4.09 and agreed that the land tools in the Philippines promote Economic

| Criterion 5 | | Weighted Mean | Standard Deviation | Descriptive Equivalent | Rank |
|--------------------|---|----------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Increased capacity of women and men to improve their production/benefit from the land. | 4.29 | .488 | Agree | 1 |
| 2. | Presence of a mechanism to integrate other support services needed to ensure the positive impact of the land tool on women and men. | 4.14 | .378 | Agree | 2 |
| 3. | Presence of mechanism to promote accessibility of the market of land products and services to both women and men. | 4.14 | .378 | Agree | 2 |
| 4. | Increase in the number of women doing formal land transactions | 3.83 | .408 | Agree | 4 |
| 5. | Presence of a statement in the tool that promotes economic opportunities for both women and men | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 3 |
| 6. | Increase in the number of women who have greater access to economic resources due to land tool | 4.14 | .378 | Agree | 2 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Average Weighted Mean | | 4.09 | Agree |
| Legend: | Scale | Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
| | 5 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| | 4 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| | 3 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| | 2 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| | 1 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

Table 5: Economic Considerations in Regard to Women’s and Men’s Access to Land

SOP No. 6: Does the tool promote scaling, coordination, and sustainability to reach more women and men?

The findings demonstrated that in criterion 6, the majority of the selected respondents having a weighted mean of 4.03, agreed that the existing land tools could

promote scaling, coordination, and sustainability and have the ability to reach more women and men. As supported by the result that in the criterion, questions one (1), three (3), and four (4) have the same highest mean of 4.14, while question no. 2 obtained the lowest mean of 3.71.

| Criterion 6 | | Weigh ted Mean | Standard Deviation | Descriptive Equivalent | Rank |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Scale of implementation of the land tool–city/local level only or nationwide. | 4.14 | .690 | Agree | 1 |
| 2. | Adaptability of the tool (responsiveness) to different situations of women and men in different localities of the country | 3.71 | .951 | Agree | 3 |
| 3. | Length or extent of land access and tenure security provided by the land tool – adhoc/temporary or long-term/permanent/Consistent | 4.14 | .690 | Agree | 1 |
| 4. | Presence of link with other land tools to uphold and protect women ‘s and men ‘s land use, land access, and land tenure security | 4.14 | .378 | Agree | 1 |
| 5. | Extent of coordination and partnership between and among communities, civil society organizations, local government units, and national government agencies in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the land tools | 4.00 | .577 | Agree | 2 |
| Average Weighted Mean | | 4.03 | | Agree | |

| | | | |
|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| Legend: | Scale | Interval | Descriptive Equivalent |
| | 5 | 4.56 – 5.00 | Strongly Agree |
| | 4 | 3.56 – 4.55 | Agree |
| | 3 | 2.56 – 3.55 | Neither agree nor disagree |
| | 3 | 1.56 – 2.55 | Disagree |
| | 1 | 1.00 – 1.55 | Strongly Disagree |

Table 6: Scale, Coordination, and Sustainability to reach more Women and Men

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, our gender assessment of Philippine LAM highlights the need for more coordinated measures to promote, secure, and preserve women's and men's equal rights to land access and land tenure security.

V. RECOMMENDATION

The researchers make the following recommendations based on the study's findings and conclusions.

- Land administration, management policies, and procedural guidelines should clearly state gender equality principles and objectives.

- Gather and evaluate gender-disaggregated data on applicants and holders of land tenure instruments, and examine how land administration and management have affected women and men differently.
- Ensure that actual responses to the land administration and management gender analysis findings are included and implemented.
- Encourage men to promote gender equality and women's empowerment in land access and tenure security.
- Develop gender sensitivity and gender mainstreaming attitudes, knowledge, and competencies among land administration and management personnel.
- Ensure that men and women are represented and involved equally in land governance organizations at all levels.

- Improve land rights holders' understanding of the importance of gender equality in land access and tenure security and how to protect it. Connect land administration and management to other support services required to help secure land tenure.
- Provide appropriate funds/resources for the gender and development strategy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

First, we would like to thank God for letting us through all the difficulties. We have felt and experienced your guidance day by day. You are the one who gives us this opportunity to continue our degree. I will keep on trusting you for my future.

We want to acknowledge and thank our professors, Dr. Bernardino P. Malang and Dr. Florinda Roberto-Garcia-Vigonte, who made this work possible; their guidance, unwavering support, and trust carried us made this study possible.

We would also like to extend our gratitude to our selected respondents who willingly gave us their time and effort in entertaining our queries and survey. Their cooperation played a vital part in gathering data that has been useful to this research.

A special thanks to our families for their continuous support and understanding when undertaking our research. Your prayers sustained us this far. Thank you.

REFERENCES

Online Sources:

- [1.] RETA 6143: Technical Assistance for Promoting Gender Equality and Women Empowerment (Financed by the Gender and Development Cooperation Fund). (2013). Retrieved from <https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/project-document/153354/37402-012-tacr-24.pdf?cv=1>
- [2.] Violeta P. Corral PAKISAMA (National Confederation of Small Farmers and Fishers Organizations) Analysis of Land Tools in the Philippines Using Gender Evaluation Criteria. (2015). http://asianfarmers.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Corral-289-289_ppt.pdf
- [3.] Home | PSUP Site. (n.d.). [Www.mysup.org](http://www.mysup.org). Retrieved October 31, 2022, from <https://www.mysup.org>
- [4.] Gender evaluation criteria for large-scale land tools – Global Land Tool Network. (n.d.). Retrieved October 31, 2022, from <https://gltm.net/download/gender-evaluation-criteria-for-large-scale-land-tools/>
- [5.] Habnet. (2022). [Unhabitat.org](https://habnet.unhabitat.org/). <https://habnet.unhabitat.org/>
- [6.] Universal Declaration of Human Rights Essays | ipl.org. (n.d.). [Www.ipl.org](http://www.ipl.org). Retrieved October 31, 2022, from <https://www.ipl.org/topics/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>
- [7.] WHY IS GENDER AN ISSUE IN ACCESS TO LAND. (n.d.). [Www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org). <https://www.fao.org/3/y4308e/y4308e05.htm>
- [8.] GENDER EQUALITY GUIDE. (n.d.). https://ops.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/buk3_gender_equality_guide.pdf
- [9.] Department of Agrarian Reform. (n.d.). [Lis.dar.gov.ph](http://lis.dar.gov.ph). Retrieved October 31, 2022, from <http://lis.dar.gov.ph/documents/7014>
- [10.] Anthony, M., Velasco, M., Regadio, C., Marie, B., & Girado. (n.d.). SECURITY OF TENURE, CAPITAL ACCUMULATION AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR POVERTY ALLEVIATION SDRC Occasional Paper Series. Retrieved October 17, 2022, from https://www.dlsu.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/No1-2014A_Security-of-Tenure_Mark-Velasco_et al-Occasional-Papers.pdf
- [11.] VOLUME 13 ISSUE 2.2 2018. (n.d.). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED596726.pdf>
- [12.] Front page | UN-Habitat. (2010). Retrieved from [Unhabitat.org](http://unhabitat.org) website: <https://unhabitat.org/>
- [13.] Land Watch Asia Land Watch Asia Issue Brief Women's Land Rights in Asia *. (n.d.). https://www.hlrn.org.in/documents/Womens_Land_Rights_in_Asia_Land_Watch_Asia.pdf
- [14.] United Nations. (n.d.). Gender equality. United Nations. Retrieved October 17, 2022, from <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/gender-equality>
- [15.] (n.d.). https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender_equality.
- [16.] (2022). [Oup.com](https://academic.oup.com/book/4642/chapterabstract/146798765?redirectedFrom=fulltext). <https://academic.oup.com/book/4642/chapterabstract/146798765?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- [17.] Kieran, C., Sproule, K., Doss, C., Quisumbing, A., & Kim, S. M. (2015). Examining gender inequalities in land rights indicators in Asia. *Agricultural Economics*, 46(S1), 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1111/agec.12202>
- [18.] WHY IS GENDER AN ISSUE IN ACCESS TO LAND. (n.d.). [Www.fao.org](http://www.fao.org). <https://www.fao.org/3/y4308e/y4308e05.htm>
- [19.] Jalal, I. (n.d.). The Meek Shall not Inherit the Earth - Gender Equality and Access to Land. [Blogs.adb.org](http://blogs.adb.org). Retrieved October 17, 2022, from <https://blogs.adb.org/blog/meek-shall-not-inherit-earth-gender-equality-and-access-land>
- [20.] maisa. (2013, December 31). Promoting Gender Equality in Land Access and Land Tenure Security in the Philippines: Consultant's Report. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/projects/documents/promoting-gender-equality-land-access-land-tenure-security-phi-tacr>
- [21.] Women in Half the World Still Denied Land, Property Rights Despite Laws. (2019). World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/03/25/women-in-half-the-world-still-denied-land-property-rights-despite-laws>
- [22.] Villa, M. (2017, January 11). Women own less than 20% of the world's land. It's time to give them equal property rights. World Economic Forum. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/women-own-less-than-20-of-the-worlds-land-its-time-to-give-them-equal-property-rights/>

- [23.] 5.a.1 Women's ownership of agricultural land | Sustainable Development Goals | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (n.d.). [Www.fao.org. https://www.fao.org/sustainable-development-goals/indicators/5a1/en/](https://www.fao.org/sustainable-development-goals/indicators/5a1/en/)
- [24.] Nations, U. (n.d.). Goal of the Week: Goal 5 Gender Equality. United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/civil-society/goal-week-goal-5-gender-equality>
- [25.] Nations, U. (n.d.). Goal of the Week: Goal 5 Gender Equality. United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/civil-society/goal-week-goal-5-gender-equality>
- [26.] SDGs: Indicator 1.4.2. (2017, July 13). Landportal.org. <https://landportal.org/node/52264>
- [27.] Official Gazette. (1988, June 10). Republic Act No. 6657. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1988/06/10/republic-act-no-6657/>
- [28.] lmb.gov.ph. (n.d.). Lmb.gov.ph. Retrieved October 17, 2022, from https://lmb.gov.ph/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=286
- [29.] Women's Land Rights, Gender-Responsive Policies and the World Bank (Philippines). (2015, June 18). Asian Farmers Association for Sustainable Rural Development. <https://asianfarmers.org/womens-land-rights-gender-responsive-policies-and-the-world-bank>
- [30.] Women's Land & Property Rights - UN Women Asia Pacific. (2019). UN Women | Asia and the Pacific. <https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/focus-areas/women-poverty-economics/women-s-land-property-rights>
- [31.] Q & A: Magna Carta of Women (Republic Act No. 9710) | Philippine Statistics Authority. (n.d.). Psa.gov.ph. Retrieved October 17, 2022, from <https://psa.gov.ph/content/q-magna-carta-women-republic-act-no-9710#:~:text=the%20magna%20carta%20of%20women,especially%20those%20in%20marginalized%20sector>
- [32.] Doss, C., &Meinzen-Dick, R. (2020). Land tenure security for women: A conceptual framework. *Land Use Policy*, 99, 105080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.105080>
- [33.] Transcending Barriers in Agriculture through Gender and Development. (2020, May 28). FFTC Agricultural Policy Platform (FFTC-AP). <https://ap.ffc.org.tw/article/1872>
- [34.] Bank, A. D. (2011, August 1). Philippines: Promoting Gender Equality through Irrigation and Rural Infrastructure - 2011. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.adb.org/results/philippines-promoting-gender-equality-through-irrigation-and-rural-infrastructure-2011>
- [35.] Ali, D. A., Deininger, K., & Goldstein, M. (2014). Environmental and gender impacts of land tenure regularization in Africa: Pilot evidence from Rwanda. *Journal of Development Economics*, 110, 262–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2013.12.009>
- [36.] Johnson, N. L., Kovarik, C., Meinzen-Dick, R., Njuki, J., & Quisumbing, A. (2016). Gender, Assets, and Agricultural Development: Lessons from Eight Projects. *World Development*, 83, 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.01.009>
- [37.] 11.3: Sociological Perspectives on Gender Stratification. (2020, June 4). Social Sci LibreTexts. https://socialsci.libretexts.org/Courses/Solano_Community_College/SOC_002%3A_Social_Issues_and_Problems/11%3A_Gender_Stratification_and_Inequality/11.03%3A_Sociological_Perspectives_on_Gender_Stratification#:~:text=A%20structural%20functionalist%20view%20of
- [38.] Gender Equality - an overview | ScienceDirect Topics. (n.d.). [Www.sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com). Retrieved October 17, 2022, from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/social-sciences/gender-equality#:~:text=The%20concepts%20of%20gender%20equality>
- [39.] GENDER EQUALITY GUIDE. (n.d.). https://ops.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/buk3_gender_equality_guide.pdf
- [40.] Nations, U. (n.d.). Gender equality can't wait – we must achieve it now for current and future generations. United Nations. Retrieved October 17, 2022, from <https://www.un.org/en/desa/we-must-achieve-it-now-current-and-future-generations>
- [41.] Blog, F. (n.d.). Survey Methods: Definition, Types, and Examples. [Https. https://www.formpl.us/blog/survey-methods](https://www.formpl.us/blog/survey-methods)
- [42.] Ponto, J. (2015). Understanding and Evaluating Survey Research. *Journal of the Advanced Practitioner in Oncology*, 6(2), 168–171. NCBI. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4601897/>
- [43.] Data Privacy Philippines. (n.d.). Data Privacy FAQs. Data Privacy Philippines. <https://www.privacy.com.ph/learn-data-privacy-compliance/data-privacy-faqs/>
- [44.] VOLUME 13 ISSUE 2.2 2018. (n.d.). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED596726.pdf>
- [45.] (2002). Gender and access to land. food and agriculture organization of the united nations. <http://www.fao.org/3/y4308e/y4308e.pdf>
- [46.] Women in Half the World Still Denied Land, Property Rights Despite Laws. (2019). World Bank. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2019/03/25/women-in-half-the-world-still-denied-land-property-rights-despite-laws>
- [47.] Department of Agrarian Reform. (n.d.). Lis.dar.gov.ph. Retrieved October 30, 2022, from <http://lis.dar.gov.ph/documents/6402>
- [48.] Official Gazette. (1988, June 10). Republic Act No. 6657. Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines. <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/1988/06/10/republic-act-no-6657/>

- [49.] (2022). Coursehero.com.
<https://www.coursehero.com/file/121382092/chapter-2docx/>
- [50.] Designing and Evaluating Land Tools with a Gender Perspective A Training Package for Land Professionals. (n.d.). Retrieved October 30, 2022, from <https://gltn.net/download/designing-and-evaluating-land-tools-with-a-gender-perspective-2011/?ind=0&wpdmdl=7656>
- [51.] package spss version: Topics by Science.gov. (n.d.). Wwww.science.gov. Retrieved October 30, 2022, from <https://www.science.gov/topicpages/p/package+spss+version>
- [52.] [ttps://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED596726.pdf](https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED596726.pdf)