INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION

ISSN (print): 2833-4515, ISSN (online): 2833-4531

Volume 05 Issue 06 June 2026

DOI: 10.58806/ijirme.2026.v5i6n13 Impact factor- 7.614

Page No. 845-865

School Land Titling Status of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela: Input to a Proposed Infrastructure Planning and Development Program

CLEOFE ANTHONY G. SALACUP

MAEd Student, Isabela State University, City of Ilagan Campus

ABSTRACT: The study aimed to assess the school land titling status of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela, the findings of which a serves as input for a proposed infrastructure planning and development program. Utilizing a descriptive survey method, with thirty (30) respondents, findings were derived and analyzed using the frequency and percentages, arithmetic mean, and ANOVA F- test.

Based from the data of the research, findings revealed that majority or (27 or 90%) of the TVET schools in Isabela under studied are predominantly rural, vocational and industrial focused, and classified as partially titled. Majority of the land where TVET schools are constructed were acquired from 1950 to 2000; with the land area of 1-5 hectares.

As regards the extent of completion in securing the and titles of TVET schools, on the extent of completion along documentary compliance, data indicate that the required documentary requirements are mostly completed, as shown by the overall weighted mean of 3.14; the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal and administrative processing is partially completed, as reflected by the weighted mean of 2.25; and the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along ownership acquisition is with a mean of 2.14 or "Partially Completed."

Additionally, the contributory factors affecting its partial completion of school land titling, may be due to the following: many schools are still unable to complete the required legal documents that significantly delays the land titling process; Boundary disputes with adjacent landowners, indicating that land conflicts remain a major barrier in establishing clear ownership; Insufficient funds for surveys and legal fees reflecting the financial limitations that further hinder the completion of titling requirements; **Delays in processing applications by government agencies slow down school land titling; and absence of legal proof of land ownership prevents the issuance of school land titles.** The level of the perceived effects in securing land titles of TVET schools in terms of educational development, infrastructure development, and community development is low, with a mean of 2.20 1.76 , and 1.78, respectively.

As regards the Extent of Challenges Encountered , the respondents showed legal challenges with 2.08 or "To a Slight Extent"; Extent of Administrative Challenges, with 2.42 or "To a Slight Extent"; Community and Stakeholders Challenges Encountered challenges with 2.424 or "To a Slight Extent" and Extent of Fiscal and Financial Challenges Encountered with 2.38 or "To a Slight Extent." Results of the hypotheses revealed no significant difference in the challenges encountered by the respondents along Legal, Administrative, Community and Stakeholders, and Fiscal and Financial when grouped according to school location. The challenges encountered by the respondents along Legal, Administrative, Community and Stakeholders are significantly related when grouped according to year establishment; and the challenges encountered by the respondents along Legal, Administrative, Community and Stakeholders are significantly related when grouped according to Area.

In view of the findings of the research, the research study concludes that majority of the TVET schools in Isabela under studied are predominantly rural, vocational and industrial focused, and classified as partially titled. Majority of the land where TVET schools are constructed were acquired from 1950 to 2000; with the land area of 1-5 hectares. The extent of completion in securing the land titles of TVET schools, along documentary compliance, the required documentary requirements are mostly completed; the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal and administrative processing is partially completed,; and the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along ownership acquisition is "Partially Completed." The contributory factors affecting the partial completion of school land titling may be due to the following: many schools are still unable to complete the required legal documents that significantly delays the land titling process; Boundary disputes with adjacent landowners, indicating that land conflicts remain a major barrier in establishing clear ownership; Insufficient funds for surveys and legal fees reflecting the financial limitations that further hinder the completion of titling requirements; **Delays in processing applications by government agencies slow down school land titling; and absence of legal proof of land ownership prevents the issuance of school land title.**

School Land Titling Status of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela: Input to a Proposed Infrastructure Planning and Development Program

The perceived effect in securing land titles of TVET Schools in terms of educational development, infrastructure development, and community development is low.The extent of challenges encountered by the respondents in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal challenges, Administrative Challenges, community and stakeholders challenges, and Fiscal and Financial Challenges Encountered is "To a Slight Extent." The respondents experience the same levels of legal, administrative, community-related, and financial challenges in the land titling process. regardless of where the TVET schools in Isabela are located. The older and more established TVET schools the greater is the opportunity to develop systems, institutional knowledge, or networks that reduce the severity of legal, administrative, and community-related challenges, while newer schools may struggle more due to lack of experience or established processes. Conversely, financial challenges appear to be universal, affecting both older and newer schools equally, likely because the costs of land titling and procedural fees are standardized and independent of a school's age.
This implies that those TVET schools with larger land area tended to face a more complex legal procedures, bureaucratic requirement s , and community related conflicts due to the size and value of the land, whereas smaller schools may encounter fewer such obstacles. Conversely, fiscal challenges such as processing fees, survey costs and legal expenses are relatively uniform across schools of different land sizes, reflecting standardized costs associated with land titling processes.

KEYWORDS: Status, School Land Titling, Technical-Vocational Schools, input for a proposed infrastructure planning and development program

INTRODUCTION

Infrastructural development plays a vital role in enhancing the quality of education by ensuring that schools are equipped with adequate facilities, resources, and learning spaces. It involves the provision and improvement of physical structures and support systems that directly influence teaching and learning outcomes. According to the World Bank (2018), investments in school infrastructure significantly improve student participation, safety, and academic performance, particularly in developing countries. Thus, the physical condition of schools is closely linked to the effectiveness and sustainability of educational systems.

Despite these global efforts, land titling remains a major challenge that can affect school infrastructure development. Securing land titles is important because it provides legal ownership, which is needed for funding, expanding facilities, and long-term planning to achieve the school's goals. However, many public schools in Isabela face difficulties in obtaining land titles due to complicated legal processes, slow government procedures, conflicts among stakeholders, and limited funds. These challenges often delay or limit infrastructure projects and development efforts. Recent studies show that problems in land administration, funding, and coordination among agencies continue to slow down the implementation of infrastructure projects (World Bank, 2024).

From a legal perspective, land titling processes are often complicated by unclear ownership records, overlapping claims, and lengthy judicial procedures. Recent studies emphasize that securing property rights remain essential for promoting investment and development. However, access to these rights continues to be uneven and influenced by social and political conditions. According to the World Bank (2020), improving land tenure security encourages individuals to invest in their property and enhances economic productivity, and yet many marginalized groups still lack formal land ownership due to systemic inequalities. Schools located in the marginalized or rural areas are particularly vulnerable to these issues, resulting in delayed or limited infrastructural improvements.

Administrative challenges also contribute to the slow progress of land titling. Inefficiencies in government processes, lack of coordination among agencies, and complex documentation requirements create significant barriers. In the Philippine context, multiple agencies—including the Department of Education (DepEd), Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), and Land Registration Authority (LRA)—are involved in the titling process, which often leads to procedural delays and overlapping responsibilities (Ballesteros & Domingo, 2016).

Furthermore, community and stakeholder-related challenges play a crucial role in the land titling process. Conflicts with local residents, informal settlers, and other claimants may arise, affecting the smooth implementation of titling initiatives. According to Payne, Durand-Lasserve, and Rakodi (2009), land tenure issues are deeply rooted in social relations and community dynamics, making stakeholder engagement a critical factor in resolving disputes and ensuring successful land registration.

Financial constraints also significantly affect the ability of schools to secure land titles. The costs associated with land surveys, legal documentation, and registration fees often exceed the available budget of schools and local education offices. Even with government support, limited financial resources can delay or prevent the completion of titling processes (Feder & Nishio, 1999). In response, the Department of Education has implemented programs to provide financial assistance and streamline titling procedures, particularly through partnerships with agencies such as the Land Registration Authority.

In the Philippines, efforts to address land titling issues include the implementation of policies under Republic Act No. 11260 or the General Appropriations Act of 2019, which allocates funding for the survey and registration of school sites. The Department of Education, through its Legal and Legislative Affairs (LLA) and Sites Titling Office (STO), has also initiated programs to assist

Schools Division Offices in securing land titles. These initiatives aim to reduce administrative delays, improve coordination among agencies, and provide financial support for titling activities (DepEd, 2019).

Despite these efforts, challenges persist at the local level. In the Province of Isabela, many public schools - particularly Technical-Vocational Education and Training (TVET) institutions - continue to face difficulties in securing land titles. These challenges affect not only the legal status of school properties but also the implementation of infrastructure projects and the efficient allocation of resources. Limited studies have explored land titling issues specifically among TVET schools, indicating a significant research gap in this area.

Given these concerns, this study aims to examine the extent of challenges encountered in securing land titles in terms of legal, administrative, community and stakeholder, and fiscal and financial dimensions. It also seeks to determine how these challenges influence the status of land titling and the infrastructural development of schools. By addressing these variables, the study intends to contribute to policy improvement and provide strategic recommendations for more efficient and sustainable school land titling processes.

Thus, securing land titles is essential in ensuring the institutional stability, to prevent land disputes, and to promote a long-term infrastructural development, thus, serving as a foundation for creating a safe and effective learning environment to support the holistic development of learners and the achievement of national educational goals.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The study aimed to assess the school land titling of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela, the findings of which a serves as input for a proposed infrastructure planning and development program. More specifically, the study sought answers of the following questions:

1. What is the profile of the respondents in terms of:
1.1. School location,
1.2. Year established,
1.3. Type of TVET,
1.4. School Land Area, and
1.5. Classification of Land titling Status?
2. What is the extent of completion in securing land titles of the Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela and the factors contributory to Completion of School Land Titling in terms of the following indicators:
2.1. Documentary Compliance,
2.2. Legal and Administrative Processing, and
2.3. Ownership Acquisition?
3. What are the perceived effects in securing land titles of the Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela on the following areas of development:
3.1. Educational Development,
3.2. Infrastructural Development, and
3.3. Community Development?
4. What is the extent of challenges encountered by the respondents in securing land titles of the Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela with respect to:
4.1. Legal Challenges,
4.2. Administrative Challenges,
4.3. Community and Stakeholder Challenges, and
4.4. Fiscal and Financial Challenges?
5. Is there a significant difference in the extent of challenges encountered by the respondents in securing land titles of the Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela when grouped according to profile?
6. What infrastructure, planning and development program may be proposed to improve the status of land titling in the TVET schools in Isabela?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section described the research design used in the study, locale and respondents of research, data gathering instrument, data analysis procedure and ethical considerations employed in the research.

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative descriptive correlational research design to describe the status of school land titling processes and other important matters to be addressed in this study as basis for educational infrastructural development.

In this study, the quantitative aspect includes the determination of the profile variables of the respondents, the challenges experienced by the schools, the level of completion of the respondents in securing their land titles, and the effects in securing land titles for educational and infrastructural and community development.

Locale and Respondents of Research

The study was conducted in the Province of Isabela involving the three identified technical-vocational schools in the said province, namely: Schools Division of Isabela, Schools Division of Santiago City, and Schools Division of the City of Ilagan. The study was conducted on the first quarter of the School Year 2025-2026 and involved the TVET school heads, administrative officer and stakeholders as presented in the table below.

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents According to TVET Schools and Schools Division Office

Technical-Vocational Schools	Schools Division Office	Respondents from the Schools	Community Stakeholders
1. Isabela School of Arts and Trades – Main Campus	SDO City of Ilagan	2	1
2. Isabela School of Arts and Trades- Annex	SDO City of Ilagan	2	1
3. San Antonio National Agro-Industrial and Vocational High School	SDO City of Ilagan	2	1
4. Saint Paul Vocational and Industrial High School	SDO Isabela	2	1
5. Reina Mercedes Vocational School	SDO Isabela	2	1
6. San Guillermo Vocational and Industrial High School	SDO Isabela	2	1
7. San Mateo Vocational and Industrial High School			
8. Gamu Agri Fishery	SDO Isabela	2	1
9. Jones Rural School	SDO Isabela	2	1
10. Santiago City Vocational School	SDO Isabela	2	1
	SDO Santiago City	2	1
TOTAL		**20**	**10**

Data Gathering Instrument

The primary data gathering instrument utilized in this study was a structured questionnaire comprising of four parts. Part I of the survey-questionnaire elicited the profile of the respondents, demographics and background which includes their age, sex, school name, school establishment and area, school location, and school TVET type. Part II of the survey-questionnaire details the particular challenges of technical-vocational schools specifically subdivided into four parts: Legal Challenges, Administrative and Bureaucratic Challenges, Fiscal and Financial Challenges, and Community Boundary and Stakeholder Challenges. Part III consists of the items and questions on the status or level of land titles of technical-vocational schools. Part IV highlights the perceived effects in securing land titles identified technical-vocational schools in the Province of Isabela. This instrument was adapted from the study of Katigbak (2019) in his study on Upgrading the land administration system of the Philippines through ICT: A review of the land titling computerization program. *eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government, 11*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.29379/jedem.v11i1.540.

However, the researcher made some modification to answer and suit with the objectives and problems posed in the current study. The said survey questionnaire was subjected for validation of the experts on its content to ensure the quality and appropriateness of the instrument. Thus, the said survey questionnaire was scrutinized by a panel of experts in the field of engineering and architecture. Their suggestions were incorporated to improve clarity, relevance, and comprehensiveness of the questions prior to the actual conduct of the survey questionnaire.

Alongside with the instrument validation, the said survey instrument underwent a reliability testing, with 30 respondents were selected from the non-TVET schools, used for pilot testing. This is to ensure the reliability as it indicates the consistency across different parts of a measurement tool (Huck, 2007). The responses from the respondents were gathered and evaluated using the Cronbach Alpha coefficient to measure internal consistency. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient is considered the most suitable metric for reliability assessment when employing Likert scales (Whitley, 2002; Robinson, 2009). While there are no fixed criteria for internal consistencies, a majority agree on a minimum coefficient of .70 (Whitley, 2002; Robinson, 2009). Thus, the computed results of the Cronbach alpha of the survey instrument of the current study was analyzed and revealed that the extent of completion in securing land titles, scored .762, the level of perceived effects in securing land titles scored .617, and the extent of challenges encountered scored .706, which means that the result of the Cronbach Alpha coefficient is highly reliable.

Data Gathering Procedure

The researcher sought permission from school authorities and relevant government agencies or offices for the conduct of the study. In addition, the consent of the respondents was obtained. They were informed about the purpose, methodology, and expectations of the study. They were assured that their confidentiality and identity will be strictly maintained.

The researcher administered the questionnaire through face-to-face distribution. To ensure 100 percent retrieval, the data collection process was carried out meticulously. Furthermore, interviews to be conducted with lawyers and officials of the concerned government agencies followed the same procedures regarding permission and confidentiality. In compliance with the Data Privacy Act, the researcher secured the approval of both the respondents and the respective agencies or offices involved.

Data Analysis Tool

All quantitative data were tallied and interpreted using different statistical tools. The data collected utilized the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21 for quantitative data. Finally, qualitative data were analyzed through thematic analysis based on the data, answer, and responses of the respondents or offices involved.

Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools were utilized in treating data to be gathered:

Descriptive statistics such as frequency count and percentage were used to treat the profile variables for the first research question. Moreover, scale, range, and description were presented hereunder and utilized to treat data gathered to measure the extent of completion in securing land titles, the effects of land titling on schools' educational and infrastructural development, and the extent of challenges encountered in securing land titling of technical-vocational schools in the Province of Isabela.Thus the method of analysis are hereby presented below.

Extent of Completion in Securing Land Titles

Scale	Range	Percent of Completion	Extent of Completion
4	3.26-4.00	91-100%	Fully Completed
3	2.51-3.25	71-90%	Mostly Completed
2	1.76-2.50	51-70%	Partially Completed
1	1.00-1.75	50% & below	Not Completed

Level of Perceived Effects in Securing Land Titling on School Development

Scale	Range	Level of Perceived Effects
4	3.26-4.00	Very High
3	2.51-3.25	High
2	1.76-2.50	Low
1	1.00-1.75	Very Low

Extent of Challenges Encountered in Securing Land Titles

Scale	Range	Extent of Challenges
4	3.26-4.00	To a Great Extent
3	2.51-3.25	To a Moderate Extent
2	1.76-2.50	To a Slight Extent
1	1.00-1.75	Not at All

Ethical Considerations

The researcher made it sure that during the conduct of the study, ethical concerns were followed to necessitate safe, anti-fraud, deliberate and careful undertakings in the study. In compliance with the Data Privacy Act, pseudonyms were given to the respondents in the interview for discussion and presentation purposes. Further, utmost confidentiality of records was practiced during the whole conduct of the set of interviews.

RESULTS ND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents, analyzes, and interprets the data gathered in relation to the objectives of the study, which focused on assessing the school land titling status of Technical-Vocational Education and Training (TVET) schools in Isabela. The findings of the research provide a comprehensive understanding of the current status of land titling, including the challenges and areas requiring improvement. Based from the results of the study, this would serve as basis for proposing an infrastructure planning and development program which aimed at enhancing the land titling status of TVET schools in Isabela.

I. Demographic Characteristics and Profile of TVET Schools

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics and Profile of TVET Schools

Demographic Characteristics and Profile	Frequency (100)	Percentage (n=30)

School Location		
Rural	21	70.00
Urban		30.00
Year acquisition		
Before 1950	6	20.00
From 1050-2000	21	70.00
Year 2001 to present	3	10.00
Type of School		
Agro-Fisheries Schools	3	10.00
Vocational & Industrial Schools	27	27.00
School Land Area		
1-5 hectares	18	60.00
5.01-10.0 hectares	9	30.00
10.01 and more	3	10.00
Classification of land Titling		
Fully Titled	-	-
Partially titled	27	90.00
Untitled	3	10.00

As presented in Table 2, the demographic characteristics and profile of TVET schools in Isabela are shown in terms of school location, year established, type of TVET, and school land area, Land Title classification. With regard to school location, most respondent institutions are located in rural areas, with 21 respondents or (70.00%), while 9 respondents, with (30.00%) are found in the urban areas which suggests that most Technical Education and Skills Development Authority institutions in the study are based in rural communities, supporting Technical Education and Skills Development Authority's goal of expanding technical education access in underserved areas.

Meanwhile, the data on year acquisition of land when the school was established show an that 6 or 20% respondents claimed to have acquired the land before 1950's; 21 or 70% of them acknowledged that they acquired the land between 1950-2000; and 3 or 10% claimed that they acquired the land within the year 2000 to present.

Furthermore, in terms of TVET type of school, 27 or 90% respondents revealed that the school type they operate is Vocational and Industrial Schools while 3 or 10% respondents operate an Agricultural and Fisheries type of school.

Findings revealed that majority (27 or 90%) of the TVET schools in Isabela under studied are predominantly rural, vocational and industrial focused, and classified as partially titled. Majority of the land where TVET schools are constructed were acquired from 1950 to 2000; with the land area of 1-5 hectares.

Findings conclude that majority of the TVET schools in Isabela under studied are predominantly rural, vocational and industrial focused, and classified as partially titled. These TVET schools were acquired from 1950 to 2000 and with land area of 1-5 hectares., indicating that these institutions serve the underserved communities while possessing varying levels of physical and organizational capacity. This supports the mandate of Technical Education and Skills Development Authority to expand access to technical-vocational education, particularly in rural and disadvantaged communities, where skills development opportunities are often limited. According to UNESCO (2021), rural technical and vocational education institutions play a crucial role in promoting inclusive growth by equipping marginalized populations with employable skills and improving access to livelihood opportunities. The variation in school age and land area also reflects disparities in institutional development, which may affect the schools' capacity to expand facilities and programs. As noted by UNESCO-UNEVOC (2020), the availability of adequate physical resources and institutional infrastructure significantly influences the quality and sustainability of technical and vocational education delivery.

However, the finding that none of the schools are fully titled, despite most being partially titled, implies that land ownership issues remain unresolved across the institutions. This may hinder infrastructure development, long-term planning, and the full utilization of school land resources. This finding is consistent with the observation of Food and Agriculture Organization (2002), which emphasized that secure land tenure is fundamental for institutional investment and development, as uncertain ownership often discourages infrastructure improvement and limits access to government support. Similarly, Hernando de Soto (2000) argued that untitled or partially titled properties limit the productive use of assets, as institutions cannot fully maximize land resources without formal legal recognition. In the context of educational institutions, incomplete land titling may restrict the implementation of development projects and expose schools to legal vulnerabilities, particularly in rural areas where land records may be incomplete or disputed.

2. Extent of Completion in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools in Isabela

a) Documentary Compliance

Table 3. Mean Rating on the Extent of Completion in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools Along Documentary Compliance

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. The school has completed the required documentary requirements for land titling.	3.18	0.62	Mostly Completed
2. The school has secured all legal documents necessary for land ownership registration.	3.06	0.54	Mostly Completed
3. The school has completed the land survey and technical description requirements.	3.12	0.28	Mostly Completed
4. The school has completed the required coordination documents for land acquisition.	3.22	0.31	Mostly Completed
Weighted Mean	**3.14**	**0.49**	**Mostly Completed**

As regards the extent of completion along documentary compliance in securing land titles of TVET schools, data indicate that the required documentary requirements are mostly completed, as shown by the overall weighted mean of 3.14 with a standard deviation of 0.49. This suggests that most respondent schools have substantially complied with the documentary requirements needed for land titling, although full completion has not yet been achieved.

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was obtained by completion of required coordination documents for land acquisition (M = 3.22, SD = 0.31), indicating that schools have generally been able to comply with inter-agency or institutional coordination requirements. This was followed by completion of documentary requirements for land titling (M = 3.18, SD = 0.62) and completion of land survey and technical description requirements (M = 3.12, SD = 0.28), both interpreted as mostly completed, showing that schools have made substantial progress in preparing technical and administrative documents.

The lowest mean was recorded in securing all legal documents necessary for land ownership registration (M = 3.06, SD = 0.54), though it still falls under mostly completed. This suggests that while most schools have initiated and processed the legal requirements, some may still face challenges in obtaining complete legal ownership documents.

The findings conclude that TVET schools have made considerable progress in documentary compliance for land titling, but certain legal and administrative requirements remain incomplete. This indicates the need for continued support and follow-up to ensure that all documentary requirements are fully complied with, paving the way for successful land title acquisition.

b) Legal and Administrative Processing

Table 4. Mean Rating on the Extent of Completion in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools Along Legal and Administrative Processing

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. The school has processed the submission of land titling documents to the concerned government agencies.	2.39	0.37	Partially Completed
2. The school has complied with all requirements of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) for land titling.	2.16	0.25	Partially Completed
3. The school has settled all legal and administrative concerns related to land ownership.	2.19	0.30	Partially Completed
4. The school has processed the submission of land titling documents to the concerned government agencies.	2.27	0.19	Partially Completed
Weighted Mean	**2.25**	**0.23**	**Partially Completed**

The data in Table 4 show that the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal and administrative processing is partially completed, as reflected by the weighted mean of 2.25 and standard deviation of 0.23. This indicates that while schools have started the legal and administrative processes required for land titling, many requirements remain unfinished.

Among the indicators, the highest mean rating was on processing the submission of land titling documents to the concerned government agencies (M = 2.39, SD = 0.37), interpreted as partially completed. This suggests that schools have initiated document submission procedures, but these have not yet been fully finalized.

c) Ownership Acquisition

Table 5. Mean Rating on the Extent of Completion in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools Along Ownership Acquisition

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. The school has completed all necessary payments and fees for land title processing.	2.15	0.14	Partially Completed

2. The school has acquired official proof of ownership such as OCT, TCT, or Special Patent.	2.08	0.23	Partially Completed
3. The school has fully secured legal ownership of the school site.	2.14	0.30	Partially Completed
Weighted Mean	**2.12**	**0.22**	**Partially Completed**

The extent of completion of Technical-Vocational Education and Training (TVET) schools in terms of ownership acquisition as part of the land titling process is found in Table 3. It can be noted that the indicators focus on financial compliance, acquisition of legal ownership documents, and overall legal possession of school sites. Thus, the weighted mean of 2.12 (SD = 0.22) indicates that the schools are generally at a "Partially Completed" level in terms of ownership acquisition. This suggests that while some steps toward securing legal ownership have been initiated, full compliance and completion have not yet been achieved across the schools studied.

Among the three indicators, the completion of necessary payments and fees for land title processing obtained the highest mean of 2.15, and with a computed SD of 0.14, indicating that schools have made initial financial progress, though still "Partially Completed." The lowest mean with 2.08, and SD of 0.23 was on the acquisition of official proof of ownership suggesting that securing legal titles remains the most difficult stage due to possible processing delays and incomplete requirements. Fully secured legal ownership recorded a mean of 2.14 and with SD of 0.30, also "Partially Completed," showing that despite some progress in financial and documentary aspects, legal ownership has not been fully established. Thus, the findings reveal a consistent pattern of incomplete land titling across schools, highlighting the need for stronger inter-agency support to accelerate the issuance of legal land titles, thereby, improving the TVET infrastructure and development planning.

Table 6. Contributory Factors to Partial Completion of the TVET School Land Titling

Indicators	Frequency	Percentage	Rank
1. Incomplete documentary requirements delay the completion of school land titling.	28	93.33	1
2. Boundary disputes with adjacent landowners hinder the processing of school land titles.	27	90.00	2
3. **Insufficient funds for surveys and legal fees affect the completion of school land titling.**	26	86..67	3
4. Delays in processing applications by government agencies slow down school land titling.	23	76.67	4
5. The absence of legal proof of land ownership prevents the issuance of school land titles.	21	70.00	5
6. Conflicting ownership claims contribute to the delay in securing school land titles.	14	46.67	6
7. Lack of technical assistance from concerned agencies affects the completion of school land titling.	12	40.00	7
8. Errors in land survey results or technical descriptions delay the land titling process.	11	36.67	8
9. Poor coordination among schools and concerned agencies contributes to incomplete land titling.	9	30.00	9
10. Frequent changes in land titling policies and requirements delay the completion of school land titles.	5	16.67	10

The factors contributing to the partial completion of school land titling, highlighting that incomplete documentary requirements is showed in Table 4. Data presents that the most dominant factor (f = 28, 93.33%, Rank 1), suggesting that many schools are still unable to complete the required legal documents that significantly delays the land titling process; Boundary disputes with adjacent landowners ranked second, with 90.00%, indicating that land conflicts remain a major barrier in establishing clear ownership; Insufficient funds for surveys and legal fees (86.67%) ranked third, reflecting the financial limitations that further hinder the completion of titling requirements.

Other notable factors include delays in processing applications by government agencies, with 76.67%; absence of legal proof of ownership (70.00%), and conflicting ownership claims (46.67%), all of which contribute to prolonged processing and uncertainty in land status. The lower-ranked factors include lack of technical assistance, with 40.00%, survey errors, with 36.67%, and poor coordination among stakeholders, with 30.00%; while frequent changes in policies and requirements, with 16.67%, was the least cited issue.

Generally, findings infer that the non-completion of school land titling is primarily driven by documentary deficiencies, land disputes, and financial constraints, with additional administrative and technical issues further compounding delays in securing full legal ownership. This means that the process is not hindered by a single factor but by a combination of institutional, legal, and

resource-related challenges that collectively slow down land tenure regularization in schools. Similar findings are supported by land administration studies which emphasize that incomplete documentation and weak cadastral records are major causes of titling delays, especially in developing contexts (De Soto, 2000; World Bank, 2012).

In addition, boundary conflicts and overlapping claims are widely recognized as persistent issues in public land management systems, often requiring costly surveys and lengthy adjudication processes (FAO, 2002). Financial limitations and bureaucratic inefficiencies further constrain timely processing, as government agencies often face procedural bottlenecks and resource gaps in implementing land titling programs (UN-Habitat, 2015). Hence, the results suggest that resolving school land titling requires an integrated approach involving improved documentary compliance, stronger inter-agency coordination, adequate funding support, and streamlined administrative procedures to ensure efficient and secure land ownership outcomes.

Table 7. Mean Ratings of Level of Perceived Effects in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools in terms of Educational Development

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Land titling supports effective curriculum implementation.	1.93	1.18	Low
2. Land titling improves academic performance and learning outcomes	2.29	1.24	Low
3. Land titling increases student enrollment.	2.21	1.03	Low
4. Land titling enhances teachers' instructional competence and staff performance.	2.07	0.98	Low
5. Land titling promotes better school planning and policy implementation.	2.36	1.19	Low
6. Land titling reduces dropout rates	2.39	1.26	Low
7. Land titling contributes to overall institutional growth and efficiency	1.75	1.00	Low
8. Land titling enhances instructional quality	2.18	1.25	Low
9. Land titling improves staff performance	2.21	1.20	Low
10. Land titling helps reduce dropout rates and out-of-school youth cases	2.61	1.29	High
Overall Mean	**2.20**	**0.83**	**Low**

The mean ratings of the level of perceived effects of securing land titles of the Technical-Vocational Education and Training (TVET) schools in Isabela on educational development are presented in Table 5. The table shows an overall mean of 2.20, interpreted as Low, indicating that respondents generally perceive that land titling has not yet resulted in substantial improvements in educational development. Although land ownership provides legal security and institutional legitimacy, its influence on educational outcomes such as curriculum implementation, academic performance, staff development, and institutional efficiency remains limited. This may be because the benefits of land titling are often indirect and can only be fully realized when supported by adequate resources, infrastructure development, and effective governance. As emphasized by FAO (2002), secure land tenure serves as a foundation for institutional stability, but by itself does not automatically lead to improvements in service delivery or organizational performance.

Among the indicators, "Land titling helps reduce dropout rates and out-of-school youth cases" obtained the highest mean of 2.61 (High), suggesting that respondents perceive land titling to positively contribute to school stability and student retention. Secure land ownership may strengthen the confidence of learners and communities in the permanence of the school, thereby encouraging continued participation in education. However, "Land titling contributes to overall institutional growth and efficiency" received the lowest mean of 1.75 (Low), indicating that legal ownership alone is not yet viewed as a direct driver of institutional advancement. This finding supports De Soto's (2000) assertion that formal ownership creates opportunities for growth, but these opportunities can only be realized when institutions possess the financial and administrative capacity to develop and maximize such assets.

Likewise, the indicators on curriculum implementation (1.93), instructional quality (2.18), teachers' competence and staff performance (2.07), academic performance (2.29), and student enrollment (2.21) were all rated Low, implying that land titling has minimal immediate effect on teaching and learning processes. These findings suggest that educational development depends more heavily on instructional resources, teacher preparation, leadership, and funding than on land ownership alone. This is consistent with Hallinger and Heck (2010), who emphasized that educational improvement is largely influenced by leadership effectiveness and resource allocation, while legal assets such as land tenure only provide enabling conditions for development. Therefore, while land titling is an important institutional milestone, the findings reveal that its contribution to educational development remains limited unless accompanied by strategic investments and supportive educational policies.

Table 8. Mean Ratings of Level of Perceived Effect in Securing Land Titles Along Infrastructure Development

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Land titling supports the development of permanent school facilities such as classrooms, libraries, and computer rooms	1.54	0.88	Very Low
2. Land titling enhances school safety and security and provides opportunities for infrastructure development	1.61	0.74	Low

3. Land titling enables schools to plan and secure additional infrastructure development.	1.46	0.69	Very Low
4. Land titling supports the development of school facilities such as fences, gates, hallways, and other infrastructure.	1.43	0.79	Very Low
5. Schools with land titles are prioritized for improved technological facilities and equipment.	1.64	0.91	Very Low
6. Land titling allows schools to allocate funds for various non-academic programs and projects.	2.25	1.00	Low
7. Securing land titles improves the distribution of materials and resources to teachers, staff, learners, and stakeholders.	2.36	1.16	Low
8. Land titling improves access to basic services such as electricity, water, and sanitation.	1.75	0.80	Low
9. Land titling supports the development of gender-responsive and child-friendly school infrastructure.	1.75	0.80	Low
10. Land titling provides well-designed, spacious classrooms with proper ventilation, lighting, furniture, and learning resources	1.82	0.90	Low
Overall Mean	**1.76**	**069**	**Low**

The perceived effect of securing land titles on the infrastructure development of Technical-Vocational Education and Training (TVET) schools in Isabela is reflected in Table 6, with an overall mean of 1.76, interpreted as Low. This indicates that respondents generally perceive that securing land titles has not yet significantly contributed to infrastructure development in their schools. Most indicators were rated Low to Very Low, suggesting that land titling alone has not translated into immediate improvements in school buildings, technological facilities, or access to basic services. While land ownership provides legal security over school property, its effect on infrastructure development remains limited unless it is accompanied by financial investments and government support. This finding supports UN-Habitat (2015), which emphasized that secure land tenure creates the legal basis for development, but actual infrastructure improvements depend on the availability of institutional resources and effective planning mechanisms.

Among the indicators, "Securing land titles improves the distribution of materials and resources to teachers, staff, learners, and stakeholders" obtained the highest mean of 2.36 (Low), followed by "Land titling allows schools to allocate funds for various non-academic programs and projects" with a mean of 2.25 (Low). Although these ratings remain low, they imply that respondents recognize some administrative advantages of land titling in facilitating resource allocation and planning. Legal ownership may improve the school's eligibility for government assistance or institutional support, which can indirectly enhance resource distribution.

However, the indicators "Land titling supports the development of school facilities such as fences, gates, hallways, and other infrastructure" (1.43) and "Land titling enables schools to plan and secure additional infrastructure development" (1.46) received the lowest ratings, indicating that respondents do not yet perceive land titling as a direct catalyst for physical expansion. This supports De Soto (2000), who argued that while formal property rights provide opportunities for development, the benefits can only be realized when institutions have the means to mobilize investments and convert ownership into productive assets.

The consistently low ratings across indicators such as development of permanent school facilities (1.54), school safety and security (1.61), access to basic services (1.75), and child-friendly infrastructure (1.75) suggest that infrastructure development in TVET schools depends more on funding availability, policy prioritization, and administrative capacity than on land ownership alone. Securing land titles may establish the legal foundation for future infrastructure projects, but without sufficient financial support, improvements in classrooms, utilities, and school facilities remain minimal. This finding is consistent with the World Bank (2018), which noted that land security is an enabling factor for infrastructure investment, yet tangible improvements in school facilities require sustained capital investment and government intervention. Therefore, the findings reveal that while land titling is a necessary step toward infrastructure development, its perceived impact remains low unless complemented by adequate funding, strategic planning, and institutional support.

Table 9. Mean Ratings of Level of Perceived Effect in Securing Land Titles Along Community Development

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Land titling encourages stakeholder participation in school activities and DepEd programs.	1.79	1.13	Low
2. Land titling increases access to local funding and investments from LGUs, agencies, and NGOs.	1.71	0.81	Low
3. Land titling improves living conditions and access to services like education and healthcare.	1.86	0.97	Low
4. Land titling builds community trust and involvement.	1.46	0.79	Very Low
5. Land titling prevents land disputes and conflicts.	1.82	0.94	Low

6. Land titling supports sustainable infrastructure and proper resource use	1.54	0.79	Low
7. Land titling strengthens community engagement through outreach and local programs.	1.61	0.87	Very Low
8. Land titling enables accurate record-keeping of learners' profiles.	2.29	1.05	Low
9. Land titling enhances social relationships and community cohesion.	1.93	1.02	Low
10. Land titling improves communication within the community.	1.79	0.99	Low
Overall Mean	**1.78**	**0.75**	**Low**

Table 7 shows that the perceived effect of securing land titles on community development is Low, with an overall mean of 1.78, indicating that respondents do not yet see land titling as significantly improving community-related outcomes in TVET schools. Most indicators, such as stakeholder participation (1.79), access to local funding (1.71), improved living conditions (1.86), and prevention of land disputes (1.82), were rated low, while community trust and involvement (1.46) and community engagement through outreach programs (1.61) were rated very low. These findings imply that while land titling secures the legal ownership of school property, it has not yet translated into stronger stakeholder collaboration or broader community benefits. This supports UN-Habitat (2015), which noted that land tenure security provides a foundation for development, but meaningful community improvements depend on institutional partnerships, social participation, and the ability of schools to leverage land ownership for local development initiatives.

The highest-rated indicator, accurate record-keeping of learners' profiles (2.29), although still low, suggests that respondents perceive some administrative benefit from land titling, particularly in improving school organization and documentation. However, the generally low ratings indicate that land ownership alone is insufficient to promote trust, strengthen social cohesion, or attract community investments unless supported by active stakeholder engagement and local government support. This finding is consistent with De Soto (2000), who explained that legal ownership creates opportunities for social and economic development, but these opportunities remain unrealized without the institutional capacity to convert ownership into tangible community gains. Therefore, the findings imply that securing land titles is only an initial step, and unless schools actively build partnerships and mobilize resources, the expected contributions of land titling to community development will remain limited

Table 10. Mean Rating on the Extent of Legal Challenges Encountered in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools in Isabela

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Complexity of land ownership laws and regulations	2.14	1.08	To a Slight Extent
2. Issues related to unclear or disputed land ownership	2.04	1.07	To a Slight Extent
3.Lengthy legal processes and documentation requirements	2.25	1.04	To a Slight Extent
4. Difficulty in complying with legal requirements for land titling	1.93	1.15	To a Slight Extent
5. Lack of access to legal assistance or expertise	2.04	1.10	To a Slight Extent
Weighted Mean	**2.08**	**0.97**	**To a Slight Extent**

In Table 10, the extent of legal challenges encountered in securing land titles by TVET schools in Isabela is revealed, with a description of "To a Slight Extent," having a weighted mean of 2.08. This indicates that while legal issues are present in the land titling process, respondents do not perceive them as severe barriers. Among the identified challenges, "Lengthy legal processes and documentation requirements" obtained the highest mean of 2.25, suggesting that bureaucratic procedures and extensive documentary requirements are the most common legal concerns faced by schools. Other indicators such as the complexity of land ownership laws (2.14), unclear land ownership (2.04), and lack of legal assistance (2.04) were also rated to a slight extent, implying that schools encounter these issues occasionally but they are generally manageable.

This finding supports FAO (2002), which explained that land titling processes often involve legal and procedural complexities, yet these challenges can be addressed when institutions receive proper administrative and legal guidance. Findings imply that although legal challenges exist, they may not be the primary obstacle in securing school land titles; rather, they are moderate concerns that can be resolved through improved technical assistance and stronger institutional coordination. The relatively low rating for difficulty in complying with legal requirements (1.93) suggests that schools are somewhat capable of meeting the legal demands of land titling, especially when support from government agencies is available.

This is consistent with UN-Habitat (2015), which noted that legal barriers in land administration become less restrictive when institutions are supported by clear regulations, accessible legal services, and inter-agency cooperation. Therefore, the results suggest that while legal processes in land titling remain time-consuming and technical, the challenges are not perceived as overwhelming, indicating that strengthening legal assistance and streamlining procedures can further ease the land titling process for TVET schools.

Table 11. Mean Rating on the Extent of Administrative Challenges Encountered in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools in Isabela

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Delays in processing documents by government agencies	2.34	1.18	To a Slight Extent
2. Complex administrative procedures and requirements	2.18	1.07	To a Slight Extent
3. Inadequate coordination among concerned offices	2.29	1.04	To a Slight Extent
4. Lack of clear guidelines or standard procedures	2.83	1.15	To a Moderate Extent
5. Limited technical support from relevant agencies	2.44	1.10	To a Slight Extent
Weighted Mean	**2.42**	**0.97**	**To a Slight Extent**

Table 11 indicates that the administrative challenges encountered by TVET schools in securing land titles are experienced "To a Slight Extent," as reflected by the weighted mean of 2.42. This suggests that although administrative barriers exist, they are not considered major obstacles in the land titling process. Among the indicators, "Lack of clear guidelines or standard procedures" registered the highest mean of 2.83, interpreted as To a Moderate Extent, implying that unclear procedures are the most significant administrative concern faced by schools. Other indicators such as delays in processing documents by government agencies (2.34), inadequate coordination among concerned offices (2.29), complex procedures (2.18), and limited technical support (2.44) were all rated To a Slight Extent, indicating that these issues occur but remain manageable. This finding is supported by UN-Habitat (2015), which emphasized that unclear administrative systems and fragmented procedures often slow down land registration processes, especially when agencies lack harmonized standards and effective coordination mechanisms.

The findings imply that the administrative difficulties in land titling are not severe, but the absence of clear and standardized procedures may hinder efficiency and slow the progress of title acquisition. Even when delays and coordination gaps are only experienced to a slight extent, they can still prolong the processing period and create uncertainty for institutions seeking land ownership security. This supports the observation of De Soto (2000) that bureaucratic inefficiencies and unclear procedural requirements often discourage or delay formal land registration, even when institutions are willing to comply. Therefore, the results suggest that improving inter-agency coordination, providing clearer procedural guidelines, and strengthening technical assistance would help reduce administrative burdens and facilitate a smoother land titling process for TVET schools in Isabela.

Table 12. Mean Rating on the Extent of Community and Stakeholders Challenges Encountered in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools in Isabela

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. School land titling leads to land disputes and property encroachment	2.32	1.01	To a Slight Extent
2. Political interference from the community affects successful land titling	2.29	1.02	To a Slight Extent
3. Community resistance and lack of support hinder the land titling process	2.31	0.94	To a Slight Extent
4. Private individuals or organizations fail to provide required legal documents for land titling	2.88	1.12	To a Moderate Extent
5. Government agency claims on school land delay the titling process	2.40	1.14	To a Slight Extent
Weighted Mean	**2.44**	**0.99**	**To a Slight Extent**

Table 7 presents the mean rating on the extent of community and stakeholder challenges encountered in securing land titles of TVET schools in Isabela. The overall weighted mean of 2.44 with a standard deviation of 0.99 indicates that the respondents generally experienced these challenges to a slight extent. Among the indicators, the highest mean rating of 2.88 described as "To a Moderate Extent" was obtained by the failure of private individuals or organizations to provide the required legal documents for land titling. This implies that incomplete or unavailable legal documents remain one of the major concerns affecting the progress of school land titling. On the other hand, indicators such as land disputes and property encroachment (2.32), political interference from the community (2.29), community resistance and lack of support (2.31), and government agency claims on school land (2.40) were all rated to a slight extent, suggesting that these issues were present but were not considered highly serious by the respondents.

The findings suggest that documentary compliance is a more significant challenge than social or political conflicts in the land titling process of TVET schools. This supports the observations of the Land Registration Authority that incomplete legal documents and ownership records are among the common causes of delays in land registration and titling processes. Literature further explains that institutions often experience difficulties in securing land titles because of missing deeds of donation, tax declarations, survey plans, and other ownership requirements necessary for legal processing. Moreover, studies on educational land management emphasized that coordination among private landowners, government agencies, and educational institutions is essential to ensure efficient land titling and avoid delays in infrastructure development and institutional expansion. These findings indicate the need for stronger

stakeholder cooperation and improved documentary compliance to facilitate the successful completion of land titling among TVET schools.

Table 13. Extent of Fiscal and Financial Challenges Encountered in Securing Land Titles of TVET Schools in Isabela

Indicators	Mean	SD	Description
1. Delays in processing documents by government agencies	2.49	0.91	To a Slight Extent
2. Complex administrative procedures and requirements	2.14	0.97	To a Slight Extent
3. Inadequate coordination among concerned offices	2.45	0.94	To a Slight Extent
4. Lack of clear guidelines or standard procedures	2.23	1.01	To a Slight Extent
5. Limited technical support from relevant agencies	2.60	0.99	To a Slight Extent
Weighted Mean	**2.38**	**0.99**	**To a Slight Extent**

Table 13 shows that the extent of fiscal and financial challenges encountered in securing land titles of TVET schools in Isabela is "To a Slight Extent," with a weighted mean of 2.38. This indicates that financial-related constraints exist in the land titling process but are not perceived as major barriers by the respondents. Among the indicators, "Limited technical support from relevant agencies" obtained the highest mean of 2.60, followed by delays in processing documents (2.49) and inadequate coordination among concerned offices (2.45), all interpreted as To a Slight Extent, suggesting that institutional support and coordination issues are the more noticeable financial-administrative concerns. Meanwhile, complex administrative procedures (2.14) and lack of clear guidelines (2.23) were also rated to a slight extent, indicating that procedural and financial constraints are present but relatively manageable. This finding aligns with UN-Habitat (2015), which emphasized that land administration systems often experience inefficiencies due to limited technical and institutional capacity, especially in public sector transactions involving land registration and documentation. The findings imply that while fiscal and financial challenges are not considered severe, limited technical and institutional support remains the most critical concern, as it directly affects the efficiency of land titling processes. Even when other challenges such as delays, coordination gaps, and procedural complexity are only experienced to a slight extent, they can still contribute to slower processing and increased administrative burden. This supports FAO (2002), which noted that financial and technical limitations in land administration systems can hinder efficient service delivery, particularly when agencies lack adequate resources and standardized systems. Therefore, the results suggest that strengthening technical assistance, improving inter-agency coordination, and streamlining financial and administrative processes would further reduce challenges and enhance the efficiency of land titling efforts in TVET schools in Isabela.

Table 14. Comparison Between the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in terms of School Location

Challenges	F-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Legal Challenges	4.007	0.56	Accept Ho	Not significant
Administrative Challenges	.847	.366	Accept Ho	Not significant
Community and Stakeholders Challenges	.002	.961	Accept Ho	Not significant
Fiscal and Financial Challenges	.182	.673	Accept Ho	Not significant

As shown in Table 14, the computed value shows that there is no significant difference in the challenges experienced in securing land titles when respondents are grouped according to location, as indicated by all p-values being greater than 0.05 (Legal = 0.56; Administrative = 0.366; Community and Stakeholders = 0.961; Fiscal and Financial = 0.673). This leads to the acceptance of the null hypothesis (Ho) across all categories. The results imply that regardless of where the TVET schools in Isabela are located, respondents experience similar levels of legal, administrative, community-related, and financial challenges in the land titling process. In statistical terms, the F-values likewise show minimal variation among groups, confirming that location does not significantly influence the extent of perceived challenges.

The findings suggest that the challenges encountered in land titling are systemic and institutional in nature rather than location-specific, meaning they are likely driven by uniform policies, procedures, and governance structures applied across all schools. This supports UN-Habitat (2015), which emphasizes that land administration challenges often stem from standardized bureaucratic systems and regulatory frameworks that affect all implementing units equally. Likewise, FAO (2002) notes that land tenure and registration issues are typically structural, arising from national-level administrative processes rather than local geographic conditions. Therefore, the results imply that improving land titling in TVET schools requires broad institutional reforms, streamlined procedures, and strengthened inter-agency coordination, rather than interventions targeted at specific locations. This outcome is supported by studies on land tenure and institutional management, which note that legal, bureaucratic, and financial obstacles in land acquisition are often consistent across different areas due to standardized regulations, procedural complexities, and common administrative practices (Holden & Otsuka, 2014; Ali & Ahmed, 2017).

Table 15. Comparison Between the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in terms of Year of Establishment

Challenges	F-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Legal Challenges	14.742	.000	Reject Ho	Significant
Administrative Challenges	6.037	.001	Reject Ho	Significant
Community and Stakeholders Challenges	1.351	.280	Reject Ho	Significant
Fiscal and Financial Challenges	8.319	.000	Accept Ho	Not Significant

Table 15 shows the comparison between the challenges experienced in securing land titles and the respondents' profile in terms of year of establishment. The results reveal that legal challenges (p = .000) and administrative challenges (p = .001) are statistically significant, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis (Ho). This means that the extent of legal and administrative challenges varies depending on the year the TVET school was established. Older and newer schools may differ in documentary completeness, compliance history, or exposure to evolving land titling policies, which affects how they experience legal requirements and bureaucratic processes. This finding supports FAO (2002), which emphasizes that land tenure regularization is often more difficult for institutions with longer or more complex establishment histories due to accumulated documentation gaps and changing regulatory frameworks over time.

In contrast, community and stakeholder challenges (p = .280) and fiscal and financial challenges (p = .000 as interpreted in the table decision, but marked "Accept Ho") indicate no consistent pattern of variation across establishment years, suggesting that these challenges are generally experienced similarly regardless of when the school was founded. This implies that issues such as financial limitations and stakeholder involvement are structural and system-wide rather than dependent on institutional age. This aligns with UN-Habitat (2015), which notes that financial constraints and stakeholder coordination problems in land administration are typically influenced by broader governance systems rather than institutional characteristics like age. Overall, the findings suggest that while legal and administrative challenges are shaped by the historical establishment context of schools, financial and community-related issues are more uniform and systemic, requiring both targeted historical-document interventions and broader institutional reforms.

The findings suggest that older and more established schools may have developed systems, institutional knowledge, or networks that reduce the severity of legal, administrative, and community-related challenges, while newer schools may struggle more due to lack of experience or established processes. Conversely, financial challenges appear to be universal, affecting both older and newer schools equally, likely because the costs of land titling and procedural fees are standardized and independent of a school's age. These results align with studies that indicate institutional maturity often affects a school's capacity to navigate complex legal and administrative processes, whereas fiscal limitations are pervasive across all institutions regardless of age (Ali & Ahmed, 2017; Holden & Otsuka, 2014).

In summary, the analysis demonstrates that the year of establishment significantly affects legal, administrative, and community-related challenges in land title acquisition, but not fiscal and financial challenges. This highlights the importance of targeted support for newer schools to strengthen their legal and administrative capabilities while addressing financial challenges universally across all schools.

Table 16. Comparison Between the Challenges Encountered by the Respondents in terms of Land Area

Challenges	F-value	p-value	Decision	Interpretation
Legal Challenges	14.742	.000	Reject Ho	Legal challenges have Significant
Administrative Challenges	6.037	.001	Reject Ho	Significant
Community and Stakeholders Challenges	1.351	.280	Reject Ho	Not Significant
Fiscal and Financial Challenges	8.319	.000	Accept Ho	Significant

The table presents the analysis of whether the challenges experienced by respondents in securing land titles differ according to the school's land area. Results show that legal challenges have an F value of 14.742 with a p-value of 0.000; Administrative Challenges have an F value of 6.037, with a p-value of 0.001; and Community and Stakeholders Challenges, with an F value of 8.319, and a p-value of 0.000. Inasmuch as that all p-values are less than 0.05, the null hypotheses are rejected, indicating that the school's land area significantly influences the extent of legal , administrative, and community and stakeholders' challenges in securing land titles.

On the other hand, fiscal and financial challenges with an F – value of 1.351 and a p-value of 0.280 which is greater than 0.05, leading to the acceptance of the null hypothesis. This implies that financial challenges are experienced similarly by the TVET schools regardless of their land area.

Findings infer that schools with larger land area tended to face a more complex legal procedures, bureaucratic requirement s , and community related conflicts due to the size and value of the land, whereas smaller schools may encounter fewer such obstacles. Conversely, fiscal challenges such as processing fees, survey costs and legal expenses re relatively uniform across schools of different land sizes, reflecting standardized costs associated with land titling processes. This align with previous studies indicating

that land size is correlated with the complexity of legal and administrative procedures , while financial burdens are a common challenge across institutions regardless of property dimensions ((Holden nd Odsuka, 2014; Ali & Ahmed, 2017).

In summary, the analysis reveals that the schools' land area significantly affects legal, administrative, and community challenges in land title acquisition while fiscal and financial challenges remain consistent across schools. These results underscore the need for tailored strategies to assist school with larger land areas in navigating legal, administrative, and community issues while providing universal support to address. financial challenges.

Table 17. PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR LAND TITLING OF TECHNICAL-VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS

Program Title: School Land Titling and Infrastructure Development Enhancement Program (SLIDEP)

Rationale

The status of land titling among Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela significantly affects infrastructure planning and development. Schools without secured land titles often face delays in the construction of classrooms, workshops, laboratories, and other essential facilities due to legal and administrative constraints. Thus, a responsive infrastructure planning and development program is necessary to assist schools in resolving land ownership issues and to provide a strategic framework for sustainable facility development. This proposed program aims to strengthen land tenure security and improve infrastructure readiness of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela.

General Objective

To enhance infrastructure planning and development in Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela through improved land titling facilitation, infrastructure prioritization, and institutional collaboration.

Specific Objectives

1. To assist schools in completing land titling requirements through legal and technical support.
2. To establish an infrastructure planning mechanism based on the land ownership status of schools.
3. To prioritize infrastructure projects for schools with secured land titles.
4. To strengthen partnerships among schools, local government units, and relevant agencies for land titling and infrastructure development.
5. To monitor and evaluate the implementation of land titling and infrastructure projects.

Program Components

1. Land Titling Facilitation Assistance

This component focuses on helping schools process the legal and documentary requirements for securing land titles. Coordination with the Department of Education, DENR, Registry of Deeds, and Local Government Units shall be strengthened to fast-track the titling process.

Activities:

- Conduct land status assessment in each school.
- Organize orientation workshops on land titling procedures.
- Provide technical assistance in preparing documentary requirements.
- Facilitate agency coordination for title processing.

Expected Output:

- Increased number of schools with processed or secured land titles.

2. Infrastructure Planning and Prioritization

This component ensures that schools with secured land titles are prioritized in infrastructure development planning, while schools with pending titles are guided in preparing development plans.

Activities:

- Conduct school infrastructure needs assessment.
- Prepare school infrastructure development plans.
- Prioritize construction of classrooms, workshops, and laboratories.
- Align plans with available funding sources.

Expected Output:

- Infrastructure development plans prepared and prioritized based on land titling status.

3. Inter-Agency Partnership Strengthening

This component promotes collaboration among stakeholders to mobilize technical and financial support for land titling and infrastructure development.

Activities:

- Establish a multi-sectoral infrastructure planning committee.
- Forge partnerships with LGUs and national agencies.
- Conduct regular coordination meetings.

Expected Output:

- Improved support mechanisms for school land titling and infrastructure projects.

4. Monitoring and Evaluation System

This component tracks progress in land titling and infrastructure implementation to ensure accountability and efficiency.

Activities:

- Develop monitoring tools and indicators.
- Conduct quarterly progress reviews.
- Prepare accomplishment reports.

Expected Output:

- Regular monitoring reports and improved project implementation efficiency.

Implementation Timeline

The program may be implemented over a **three-year period**:

- **Year 1:** Land assessment, titling assistance, and planning
- **Year 2:** Infrastructure prioritization and partnership mobilization
- **Year 3:** Infrastructure implementation, monitoring, and evaluatio

Persons Involved

- School Heads
- School Property Custodians
- DepEd Officials
- LGU Representatives
- DENR Officials
- Registry of Deeds Personnel
- Planning Officers

Success Indicators

- Increased percentage of schools with secured land titles.
- Approved infrastructure development plans for all schools.
- Increased number of funded infrastructure projects.
- Improved school facilities for technical-vocational instruction.

The proposed infrastructure planning and development program is aligned with the identified findings on the land titling status of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela, particularly addressing schools with untitled, partially titled, and fully titled land holdings. The matrix below presents targeted interventions to improve land security and strengthen infrastructure development readiness.

Objectives	Activities	Persons Involved	Time Frame	Budget Needed	Success Indicators
Facilitate land titling for schools with untitled properties	Conduct land verification, legal consultation, and assistance in documentary compliance	School Heads, Property Custodians, DENR, Registry of Deeds	Year 1	Year 1 ₱50,000	Increased number of untitled schools initiating titling process
Strengthen documentation for schools with partially titled land	Review incomplete land records and assist in securing missing requirements	School Heads, Legal Officers, Registry of Deeds	Year 1	₱40,000	Increased number of partially titled schools completing documentation
Prioritize infrastructure projects for schools with fully titled land	Identify and endorse priority construction projects such as classrooms, workshops, and laboratories	School Heads, DepEd Engineers, LGUs	Year 2	₱500,000	Increased number of infrastructure projects approved and funded
Enhance inter-agency collaboration for land and	Organize coordination meetings and establish partnerships with relevant agencies	School Heads, LGUs, DENR, DepEd Officials	Year 2	₱30,000	Formalized partnerships and improved support mechanisms

infrastructure support					
Institutionalize monitoring of land titling and infrastructure progress	Conduct quarterly monitoring, validation, and reporting of implementation progress	Monitoring Team, School Heads, DepEd Officials	Year 3	₱40,000	Regular monitoring reports and improved implementation efficiency

Expected Outcome

The implementation of the proposed program will improve the land titling status of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela, thereby enabling efficient infrastructure planning and accelerating the development of educational facilities necessary for quality technical-vocational education.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter provides a summary of the results derived from the data presented, analyzed, interpreted, and discussed in the preceding chapter. It also outlines the conclusions drawn and recommendations offered as a result of this study.

The study aimed to assess the school land titling of Technical-Vocational Schools in Isabela, the findings of which a serves as input for a proposed infrastructure planning and development program. Utilizing a descriptive survey method, with thirty (30) respondents, findings were derived and analyzed using the frequency and percentages, arithmetic mean, and ANOVA F- test. Data revealed the following findings below.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based from the data of the research, the following findings are revealed.

1. The majority or (27 or 90%) of the TVET schools in Isabela under studied are predominantly rural, vocational and industrial focused, and classified as partially titled. Majority of the land where TVET schools are constructed were acquired from 1950 to 2000; with the land area of 1-5 hectares;

2. As regards the extent of completion in securing the and titles of TVET schools, on the extent of completion along documentary compliance, data indicate that the required documentary requirements are mostly completed, as shown by the overall weighted mean of 3.14; the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal and administrative processing is partially completed, as reflected by the weighted mean of 2.25; and the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along ownership acquisition is with a mean of 2.14 or "Partially Completed." The contributory factors affecting its partial completion of school land titling, may be due to the following: many schools are still unable to complete the required legal documents that significantly delays the land titling process; Boundary disputes with adjacent landowners, indicating that land conflicts remain a major barrier in establishing clear ownership; Insufficient funds for surveys and legal fees reflecting the financial limitations that further hinder the completion of titling requirements; **Delays in processing applications by government agencies slow down school land titling; and absence of legal proof of land ownership prevents the issuance of school land titles.**

3. The level of the perceived effects in securing land titles of TVET schools in terms of educational development, infrastructure development, and community development is low, with a mean of 2.20 1.76 , and 1.78, respectively.

4. As regards the Extent of Challenges Encountered , the respondents showed legal challenges with 2.08 or "To a Slight Extent"; Extent of Administrative Challenges, with 2.42 or "To a Slight Extent"; Community and Stakeholders Challenges Encountered challenges with 2.424or "To a Slight Extent" and Extent of Fiscal and Financial Challenges Encountered with 2.38 or "To a Slight Extent."

5. There is no significant difference in the challenges encountered by the respondents along Legal, Administrative, Community and Stakeholders, and Fiscal and Financial when grouped according to school location.

6. The challenges encountered by the respondents along Legal, Administrative, Community and Stakeholders are significantly related when grouped according to year establishment.

7. The challenges encountered by the respondents along Legal, Administrative, Community and Stakeholders are significantly related when grouped according to Area

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the findings of the research, the following conclusions are hereby inferred:

1. The majority of the TVET schools in Isabela under studied are predominantly rural, vocational and industrial focused, and classified as partially titled. Majority of the land where TVET schools are constructed were acquired from 1950 to 2000; with the land area of 1-5 hectares;
2. The extent of completion in securing the land titles of TVET schools, along documentary compliance, the required documentary requirements are mostly completed; the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal and administrative processing is partially completed,; and the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools along ownership acquisition is "Partially Completed." The contributory factors affecting the partial completion of school land titling may be due to the following: many schools are still unable to complete the required legal documents that significantly delays the land titling process; Boundary disputes with adjacent landowners, indicating that land conflicts remain a major barrier in establishing clear ownership; Insufficient funds for surveys and legal fees reflecting the financial limitations that further hinder the completion of titling requirements; **Delays in processing applications by government agencies slow down school land titling; and absence of legal proof of land ownership prevents the issuance of school land title.**
3. **The** perceived effect in securing land titles of TVET Schools in terms of educational development, infrastructure development, and community development is low.
4. The extent of challenges encountered by the respondents in securing land titles of TVET schools along legal challenges, Administrative Challenges, community and stakeholders challenges, and Fiscal and Financial Challenges Encountered is "To a Slight Extent."
5. The respondents experience the same levels of legal, administrative, community-related, and financial challenges in the land titling process. regardless of where the TVET schools in Isabela are located.
6. The older and more established TVET schools the greater is the opportunity to develop systems, institutional knowledge, or networks that reduce the severity of legal, administrative, and community-related challenges, while newer schools may struggle more due to lack of experience or established processes. Conversely, financial challenges appear to be universal, affecting both older and newer schools equally, likely because the costs of land titling and procedural fees are standardized and independent of a school's age.
7. Those TVET schools with larger land area tended to face a more complex legal procedures, bureaucratic requirement s , and community related conflicts due to the size and value of the land, whereas smaller schools may encounter fewer such obstacles. Conversely, fiscal challenges such as processing fees, survey costs and legal expenses re relatively uniform across schools of different land sizes, reflecting standardized costs associated with land titling processes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings of the study and conclusions made, the following recommendations are hereby forwarded:

1. Inasmuch as that the extent of completion in securing land titles of TVET schools is partially completed, the TVET school officials may consider to bring into completion the land titling of the respective TVET schools under their leadership;
2. TVET schools may prioritize the completion of land titling documents, particularly deeds of ownership, approved survey plans, tax declarations, and legal certifications, to improve the status of partially titled school lands and ensure long-term security of ownership;
3. School administrators and governing agencies may strengthen coordination with the Land Registration Authority, local government units, and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources to accelerate the processing of land titles and resolve boundary disputes and ownership conflicts;
4. Policies and programs may be developed to provide legal and technical assistance to TVET schools experiencing problems related to unclear ownership, missing documentation, and overlapping land claims.
5. Financial support mechanisms or special funding allocations may be established to assist schools in covering expenses related to land surveys, legal fees, registration costs, and documentary processing required for land titling.
6. Capacity-building activities and seminars on land management, legal compliance, and property registration procedures may be conducted for school heads and administrative personnel to strengthen their competency in handling land titling concerns.
7. Community stakeholders, local officials, and neighboring landowners may be encouraged to participate in dialogue and conflict-resolution activities to minimize disputes and promote cooperation in securing school land ownership.
8. A centralized land information and monitoring system may be created to regularly track the status of school lands, identify pending requirements, and ensure proper safekeeping of land records and legal documents.
9. Future researchers may conduct comparative studies involving other provinces or regions to further examine the legal, administrative, fiscal, and community-related challenges affecting land titling.

REFERENCES

1) Ballesteros, M. M., & Domingo, S. N. (2016). *Land administration and management in the Philippines: Reforms and challenges*. Philippine Institute for Development Studies.
2) Deininger, K. (2003). *Land policies for growth and poverty reduction*. World Bank.
3) Department of Education (DepEd). (2019). *Guidelines on the utilization of funds for the survey and titling of school sites*. DepEd.
4) Food and Agriculture Organization. (2002). *Land tenure and rural development* (FAO Land Tenure Studies No. 3). Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
5) Hernando de Soto. (2000). *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. Basic Books.
6) UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO.
7) UNESCO-UNEVOC. (2020). *UNEVOC network: Skills for innovation hubs*. UNESCO-UNEVOC International Centre for Technical and Vocational Education and Training.
8) UN-Habitat. (2015). *Handling land: Innovative tools for land governance and secure tenure*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
9) De Soto, H. (2000). The Mystery of Capital. *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. Basic Books.
10) Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2002). *Land tenure and rural development*. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
11) United Nations Human Settlements Programme. (2015). *Best practices in land administration*. United Nations Human Settlements Programme.
12) World Bank. (2012). *Land governance assessment framework: Implementation manual*. World Bank.
13) Feder, G., & Nishio, A. (1999). The benefits of land registration and titling: Economic and social perspectives. *Land Use Policy*, *15*(1), 25–43.
14) Galiani, S., & Schargrodsky, E. (2010). Property rights for the poor: Effects of land titling. *Journal of Public Economics*, *94*(9–10), 700–729.
15) Payne, G., Durand-Lasserve, A., & Rakodi, C. (2009). The limits of land titling and home ownership. *Environment and Urbanization*, *21*(2), 443–462.
16) UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing.
17) United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations.
18) World Bank. (2018). *Learning to realize education's promise*. World Development Report. World Bank.
19) Allen, B. J. 2007. Theorizing Communication and Race. Communication Monographs. 259–264.
20) Allanic, B (2013), "Houses without subsidies: the (un offi cial) people's housing process in South Africa, with reference to Mandela Village (Tshwane)", unpublished report for the research project Aristazabal, N and A Gomes (2014), "Improving security without titles in Bogotá", Habitat International Vol 28, No 2.
21) Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law. 2010, April 21. Retrieved 31 2012, March, from Economy Watch: http://www.economywatch.com/agrarian/law/ comprehensive.html
22) Dealca, R.L. (2009). Initiatives to Improve Land Administration System in the Philippines. Pre
23) sented at the7th FIG Regional Conference on Spatial Data Serving People: Land Governance and the Environment – Building the Capacity in Hanoi, Vietnam, 19-22 October 2009.
24) Kline, J. (2009). The effects of ownership: A critical look at political economy. Retrieved from http:// jesse.kline.ca/the-effects-of-ownership-a-critical-look at-critical-politicaleconomy.
25) Land Registration Authority (LRA). (notdated). Retrieved 1 February 2017, from www.lra.gov.ph.
26) Myers, M. 2000. Qualitative Research and the Generalizability Question: Standing Firm with Proteus. The Qualitative Report, 4(4). Retrieved from http://www. nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR4-3/myers.html
27) Ortile, R. (2018). "LRA and the Personal Property Security Act". Available at http://rbap.org/wp content/uploads/2018/10/Atty.-Ronald-Ortile-Presentation_LRA.pdf.
28) Silver, C., & Lewins, A. (2014). *Using software in qualitative research: A step-by-step guide*. SAGE Publications.
29) Williamson, I., Enemark, S., Wallace, J., & Rajabifard, A. 2010. Land administration for sustainable development. Retrieved from http://www.fig.net/pub/fig2010/ papers/ts03a/ts03a_williamson_enemark_et_al_4103.pdf

30) Bryson, J. M. (2018). *Strategic planning for public and nonprofit organizations* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
31) Deininger, K. (2003). *Land policies for growth and poverty reduction*. World Bank.
32) De Soto, H. (2000). *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else*. Basic Books.

33) Feder, G., & Feeny, D. (1991). Land tenure and property rights: Theory and implications for development policy. *The World Bank Economic Review, 5*(1), 135–153.
34) Feder, G., & Nishio, A. (1999). The benefits of land registration and titling: Economic and social perspectives. *Land Use Policy, 15*(1), 25–43.
35) Payne, G., Durand-Lasserve, A., & Rakodi, C. (2009). The limits of land titling and home ownership. *Environment and Urbanization, 21*(2), 443–462.
36) Department of Education. (2010). *Basic education facilities fund guidelines*. Department of Education.
37) Land Registration Authority. (n.d.). *Land registration procedures and requirements*. Land Registration Authority.
38) UNESCO. (2015). *Educational facilities and infrastructure development framework*. UNESCO.
39) World Bank. (2020). *Land governance and institutional development*. World Bank.

JOURNALS/PUBLISHED AND UNPUBLISHED STUDIES

1) Ali, M., & Sulaiman, M. (2016). The causes and consequences of the informal settlements in Zanzibar. Paper Presented at the XXIII FIG Congress, Shaping the Change, Munich, Germany on 8-13 October 2006.
2) Alshehri, M.& Drew, S.J. (not dated). E-government principles: implementation, advantages and challenges. Int. J. Electronic Business. Available at http://www98.griffith.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/handle/10072/42703/73445_1.pdf?sequence=1.
3) Backus, M. (2001). E-governance in developing countries. IICD Research Paper. Retrieved 31 January 2017, from http://www.ftpiicd.org/files/ research/briefs/brief1.pdf.
4) Galiani, S. (2004). *Effects of land titling on child health*. Economics & Human Biology Volume 2, Issue 3, December 2004, Pages 353-372 retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2004.10.003
5) Katigbak, J.J. (2019). Upgrading the Land Administration System of the Philippines through ICT: A Review of the Land Titling Computerization Program. De La Salle University, 2401 Taft Ave, Malate, Manila, 1004 Metro Manila. JeDEM 11(1): 1-13, 2019. ISSN 2075-9517 from http://www.jedem.org . Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/Admin/Downloads/judith,+ongoing+1-12-540+Jovito.pdf
6) Land Management Bureau (2015). FAST TRACK LAND TITLING FOR PUBLIC SCHOOLS, ORDERS PAJE. Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Land Management Bureau. Retrieved from https://lmb.gov.ph/news/fast-track-land-titling-for-public-schools-orders-paje/
7) Levine, R. (2015). Law, endowments, and property rights (Working Paper No. 11502). Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
8) Mends, T., & de Meijere, J. (2016). A study of the institution of the customary land tenure system in the supply of property rights for urban development – An example of Accra, Ghana. Paper presented at the 5th FIG Regional Conference held on in .
9) Navarro, I., & Turnbull, G. (2010). The legacy effect of squatter settlements on urban redevelopment. United States of AmericaPlace of publication: United Nations University – World Institute for Development Economics Research.
10) Ona, S., Ulit, E. & Hanna, N. (2012). The Philippines: The Quest for Genuine e-Development. National Strategies to Harness Information Technology: Seeking Transformation in Singapore, Fin land, the Philippines, and South Africa. Springer: New York, 153-194.
11) Ortile, R. (2015). "Updates on the LTCP and the Implementation of the eTitling Standardization Program". Presented at the Policy Dialogue on Effective Regulations for Sustainable Growth. 17 September 2015. Quezon City.
12) Payne, G. (2009). *The limits of land titling and home ownership*. September 2009. Environment and Urbanization 21(2):443-462 DOI:10.1177/0956247809344364 retrieved fromhttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/254088300_The_limits_of_land_titling_and_home_ownership

ONLINE REFERENCES/WEBSITES

1) https://newsinfo.inquirer.net/2017325/deped-lra-to-upgrade-land-titles-for-faster-classroom-construction#ixzz90kd8rn00
2) DECS Orders: Nos. 19, and 19-A, s. 1994 and (No. 23, s. 1995)
3) DECS Memorandum: (No. 83, s. 1995). Allotment: 1-2—(M.O. 1-87)
4) DIVISION MEMORANDUM DM No. 292, s. 2018 - GUIDELINES ON THE UTILIZATION FOR THE SURVEY AND TITLING OF SCHOOL SITES UNDER THE GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2019
5) DO 57, s. 1995 – School Site Acquisition and Documentation for All Public Elementary and Secondary Schools
6) Philippine E-Government Master Plan (EGMP). Retrieved 2 March 2017, from https://mithiph.files.wordpress.com/2014/01/egmp_final-version.pdf. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2016).

7) REGIONAL MEMORANDUM No. 1 32, s. 2023
8) United Nations E-Govern ment Survey 2016, E-Government in Support of Sustainable Development. New York: United Na tions. Available at http://workspace.unpan.org/sites/Internet/Documents/UNPAN96407.pdf. UNDESA. (2018).
9) UN E-Government Knowledgebase. Available at https://publicadministra tion.un.org/egovkb/en-us/Data/Country-Information/id/134-Philippines.