



Linking Land Tenure and Use for Shared Prosperity

ANNUAL WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY
WASHINGTON DC, MARCH 23-27, 2015



WOMEN IN THE COLOMBIAN LAND RESTITUTION AND TITING PROCESS – A RDS HOUSEHOLD SURVEY OF IDPS

HENRIK WIIG

Department of International Studies,
Norwegian Institute of Urban and Regional Research, Norway

henrik.wiig@nibr.no

JEMIMA GARCÍA-GODOS

Department of Sociology and Human Geography
University of Oslo, Norway

**Paper prepared for presentation at the
“2015 WORLD BANK CONFERENCE ON LAND AND POVERTY”
The World Bank - Washington DC, March 23-27, 2015**

Copyright 2015 by author(s). All rights reserved. Readers may make verbatim copies of this document for non-commercial purposes by any means, provided that this copyright notice appears on all such copies.

Abstract

The Victims' Law from 2011 in Colombia initiated a land restitution process that potentially would benefit more than 5 million Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) that lost an estimated 7-8 million hectares of land when they fled their homes in the countryside due to the conflict. The government helps them to reclaim the same piece of land and give support to return. Women are supposed to receive preferential and differentiated treatment in the process and the land is furthermore jointly titled as a gender equality measure. However, the process is slow and even less people is willing to actually return from their current place of residence shows our RDS household survey sample of 499 IDP households. Fear of repeated displacement, psychological trauma related to the place of origin especially among women and loss of agricultural knowledge influences their willingness to return. Both Survey and key informant interviews shows that gender perspective is reasonably successful but women have less intention than men to claim land restitution, return and make use of the land.

Key Words:

Colombia, Conflict, Land Restitution, Land Titling, Gender Equality

Introduction

Colombian Law 1448 of 2011, known as the Victims' Law, addresses the issue of internal displacement and land dispossession caused by the armed conflict in the Colombia. More than 5 million Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) has lost an estimated 7-8 million hectares of agricultural land that fled their homes in the countryside due to the conflict (CODHES 2010). The purpose of the law is to restitute exactly the same land parcel to any family that left the land after 1991 and facilitate their return by giving protection, rebuild infrastructure and securing future property rights through a land titling process. The overall objective of the law is twofold: (i) to help poor IDPs to a better life by giving them the means to sustain themselves and (ii) to break the vicious circle that land grabbers in time of conflict will actually keep their loot when peace return, something that might spark and fuel future conflict in the country (García-Godos and Wiig, 2014).

Women are poorly linked to the land in Colombia. Agriculture is mainly a male activity and the land hence perceived as the property of men. The conflict furthermore destroyed many families. The men were killed leaving the widows as household heads or the stress of the displacement caused marriage breakups. The Colombian government hence wanted to secure gender equality in the land restitution process in two ways. *Preferential and differential treatment* implies that the land restitution institutions will give more and first support women in the application, administrative and legal parts of the process, for example do many women not know the exact geographic position or borders of the abandoned parcels. The Victims' Law also sets the principle of *Joint titling*. The couple at the time of abandonment will be share the property right to the land independent of current household formation and the way land was originally acquired. This measure implies an active redistribution from men to women since most land is male property, for example through male preference in inheritance, and contradicts the partial community property marriage regime that secures individual to land brought into the marriage. The policy hence follows the example of Peru where joint titling has empowered women (Wiig, 2013)

This presentation is based on a joint Colombian and Norwegian collaborative research project using both qualitative and quantitative methods¹. I will first present the experience on gender issued as reported by land restitution related institutions and actors so far. Even though the process is slow and thorough, as most legal processes in Colombia, and the restitution courts has so far only issued processed claims for 20.877 hectares of land, is it possible identify the process for women (García-Godos and Wiig, 2014). The URT is reasonably successful in convincing women to claim their rights, but preferential treatment has turned out to be difficult in the administrative and legal phases as the unit works by subunit. Surprisingly, joint titling seems to be accepted by men. However, this might be due to the

¹ See Project homepages www.colombialandgender.org, financed by The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Main partners are Professor Francisco Gutierrez, National University, and assistant professor Paola Garcia Reyes, University of the North, in the Land Observatory Project financed by Colciencias, see homepages <http://transformacionesagrariasypaz.com/>. I furthermore thank Daniel Contreras, Camilo Argoty, the survey collection team organised by my partners, and Jose Manuel Arencibia Aleman for excellent research assistance at NIBR.

high number of former land reform farms where the land was initially given by the government to both spouses. The resistance might increase when areas of longer history of individual ownership, and hence male inheritance, are included in process.

We also conducted a Respondent Driven Sample (RDS) survey in 2014 of 499 IDP households currently living in the Bogota and Barranquilla area, 259 in the former and 240 in the latter. Only households with land in municipalities where the restitution process had started were included. Each of the initial IDP respondents supplied up to 5 new IDP household from their network. By reaching until 7 subsequent rounds in this snowball sampling method, the data set is hence representative for all IDPs within respectively Bogota and Barranquilla. We ask about the household history, their expectations and experience with the land restitution process and preferences for the future. The overall result verifies the impression of the quantitative research. Especially female IDP respondents are reluctant to return to their original places of residence; only 19% has any plans to return compared to 38% for men. They fear new rounds of displacement and furthermore carry a negative connotation to their place of origin due to the horrors experienced when displaced.

Few have actually been involved in the restitution process and even less made any concrete measure to return. A rather long residence in urban areas, loss of agricultural practice, new livelihood strategies as well as now being accustomed to more urban way of life with access to infrastructure reduces their willingness to return. The RDS dataset is unique representative source of information on IDPs and the land restitution process in Colombia which has not conducted any large scale representative survey on IDPs since 2008 (IDP-Commission, 2010). The presentation will give gender related descriptive statistics, for example reflecting how the displacement experience destroys families. 19 percent of the household consist are single headed by men (of which more than half is actually alone), 27 percent led my women alone and 54 percent of the household have a couple. Such lack of matrimonial unity is probably a hindrance for return.

We find in the RDS survey that only 21 percent of the sample intends to claim land restitution and actually return to the place of origin, and woman considerably less interested than men. Women seem to be reasonably informed about the process and do not report less confidence in the process. It is not possible to conclude from our RDS survey whether the women receive differential and preferential treatment, but our qualitative investigation indicates such does not take place.

However, the outcome has a clear gender difference as the share of all households that has actually done anything to register a claim to land restitution, intends to return in order to use the land themselves, is only 1.5 percent for single woman headed households, compared to 9.3 percent for single male headed and 10.5 percent for couple headed households.

Our survey indicate clearly that neither men nor women accept joint land titling if the land inherited by either side and is considered individual according to civil law. The joint titling in the Victims' Law is probably hence considered an imposition by the state on private property rights.

The land restitution process is furthermore an implicit land reform since the state will now become the guarantor of property rights through the accompanying land titling process. Until now, the ultimate property right belong to local powerlords in a semi-feudal system in the countryside (Wiig, 2008). The land demand side analysis from this RDS survey on land restitution reflects and test hypothesis' that is relevant for the ongoing peace negotiations between the Colombian government and the FARC guerrilla in Havana facilitated by Norway. An "integral rural reform" constitutes the first element of a future peace agreement which will probably include a land reform redistributing 10 million hectares of agricultural land. Networks of IDPs to the countryside, level of education and work experience, etc. will probably impact their willingness to start farming as for other landless poor people in rural areas that will potentially benefit from such land reform.

Women in the Colombian land restitution process

Intention of the law and institutional arrangement

Law 1448 – Main features

The Victims' Law covers victims of illegal armed groups such as paramilitaries and guerrillas, as well as members of the Colombian police and armed forces. Reparations can be claimed for harm since 1 January 1985, while land and property restitution applies for acts committed after 1 January 1991. The law does not affect the judicial processes implemented under the Law of Justice and Peace. Compared to the Justice and Peace process, the threshold of proof is significantly reduced in favour of the victim.

The definition of 'victim' is established by Art. 3, which takes as its point of departure violations of international humanitarian law and international human rights law committed after 1 January 1985. Victims include those who suffered violations, as well as their closest relatives, independent of status or identification of the perpetrator. Members of armed groups are not considered victims; the sole exception being children or youngsters who demobilized while still minors. Relatives of illegal armed groups can be considered victims only if their individual rights have been violated.

Persons whose rights were violated in the context of armed conflict prior to 1985 are entitled to the right to truth, symbolic reparations and guarantees of non-repetition, but only as part of collective measures directed at society at large. Articles 13 to 27 establish principles to guide implementation of this law, the most relevant in this context being the principles of differential treatment (Art. 13), progressiveness (Art.

17), gradual implementation (Art. 18), and the rights to truth, justice and integral reparation (Articles 23–25). Art. 28 explicitly addresses what is to be considered as victims’ rights in the framework of Law 1448, highlighting twelve specific rights, including ‘the right to truth, justice and reparation’ and ‘the right to return to one’s place of origin or relocate out of free will, in conditions of security and dignity’.

The scope and mechanisms for land and property restitution are established in great detail in Articles 71–123. Formal owners (*propietarios*), persons in possession of the land (*posesionarios*), or those using state lands (*ocupantes*) who have been disposed or forced to abandon the land due to the armed conflict after the cut-off date are entitled to the right of restitution of land and property (Art. 75). The law also establishes the categories of abandonment and dispossession as bases for restitution, identifying restitution as the preferred form of reparation for victims. Restitution encompasses the return of the property lost, as well as the formalization of legal entitlements (formal property rights) (Art. 72). The law envisages the possibility of monetary compensation or relocation to land/property of similar characteristics to that which was lost only as a secondary measure and in cases where material restitution is not feasible (Art. 97).

Law 1448 has been regulated by various subsequent decrees and directives explicitly addressing specific aspects of the law.² For instance, there are special regulations for each ethnic group in accordance to the principle of differential treatment, special regulations concerning the Registry of Usurped and Abandoned Lands and the National Victims Registry, and various administrative directives concerning specific parts of registration processes. All in all, the restitution process is a complex endeavour involving a large number of institutional actors at various stages of the process.

Where are ‘women’ in Law 1448?

To protect women’s access to land and enhance gender equality, Law 1448 establishes preferential treatment for women in the process of land restitution (Articles 114-118). Such preferential treatment encompasses prioritization of cases when the applicant is a woman, and the general mainstreaming of gender perspectives in the administrative and judicial process. Women whose land is restituted are also entitled to various additional benefits according to Law 731 of 2002. Furthermore, in restitution cases involving the formalization of a property title, the new title will be issued in the name of both the man and his partner or spouse at the moment of dispossession or abandonment, as a way of ensuring women’s access to property and land (Art. 18).

² An updated list of decrees regulating Law 1448 can be found at <http://www.unidadvictimas.gov.co/index.php/en/normativa>, accessed 23 June 2014.

The emphasis on differential treatment in general and preferential treatment towards women has been followed up by the various institutions created by the law in terms of special procedures and internal guidelines. A state policy on the protection of women victims of the armed conflict, where the issue of land restitution and access to land forms part of a priority area, was approved recently. A direct follow-up has been the signing of a cooperation agreement between the Specialized Unit for Land Restitution (URT) and the Presidential Commissioner for the Equality of Women in June 2014, aiming, *inter alia*, to mainstream gender indicators in the restitution process, provide capacity-building on gender differentiation among judicial and administrative staff working at various stages of the restitution process, and strengthening female victims of armed conflict.³

Qualitative gender experiences with restitution

Differential and preferential treatment

There was a great fear that women would not be included in the land restitution and land titling experience as agriculture is normally perceived as a male activity and the man considered the household head in Colombia. The law hence imposes joint titling between the man and woman (at the moment of displacement) to secure that women was left without land right and hence the most important form of capital/wealth for the rural population. Woman was furthermore considered to be in a weak position to claim rights as she might consider the land to be the property of men as women adapt the general gender norm of the society, which in Colombia is considered to be male-biased (*machista*). The government hence intended to give women both preferential and special treatment in the restitution process to compensate for lack of own will and knowledge, e.g. the actual whereabouts of the land plot.

As discussed in section 2, women – in particular, single mothers who head a household – are to receive differential and preferential treatment in accordance to the Victims' Law at all stages of the process: in the application and administrative phase (Art. 114), at the judicial phase (Art. 115), and during the liberation and transfer of property (Art. 116). They are also to be the first to receive other types of additional support like credit, productive projects, education and other individual goods of limited supply. The requirement of joint property rights between the couple who originally abandoned the property is apparently gender-neutral. However, agriculture is mainly a male activity and land is normally perceived to be the property of men: most inherited land is passed on to sons rather than daughters. The Victims'

³ 'Nuevas alianzas fortalecen los derechos de la mujer en la restitución de tierras', <http://restituciondetierras.gov.co/?action=article&id=1215>, accessed 23 June 2014.

Law implicitly defines its provisions on joint property as being a gender-equalizing policy by including Article 118 under the section heading ‘Norms for women in the restitution processes.

Public discussion concerning joint titling in the Victims’ Law and contradictions with the Civil Code has been almost absent in Colombia. Few are aware that joint titling overruns the individual right of spouses who have brought property into the marriage or inherited as defined in the civil law. Gender activists consider joint titling as a means to counter structural gender discrimination (SismaMujer 2013). While the law states that both sons and daughters should inherit equally, men continue to inherit land more often than women do. In practice, what joint titling does is to balance a daughter’s unlawful loss (not having inherited) with the transfer of property rights to her brother’s wife. While this logic may make sense at the structural level, the rights of the individual woman may not necessarily be protected. In this perspective, women are considered more as a group rather than as individuals.

Differential and preferential treatment to women in the restitution process is guided by two policy documents. First, the ‘Programme for special access for women, girls and youngster in the administrative stage of the restitution of disposed land process’ was approved by a resolution in late 2013 (URT 2013). While mainstreaming female preference is treated in very general terms, the resolution refers to a ‘technical document’ to be produced by the URT, and explicitly opening for the possibility to access non-governmental funding sources to finance the ‘programme’. The second policy document is a recent government White Paper providing perspectives on the protection of female victims of the armed conflict and their rights (DNP 2013).

Outcome

According to interviews we carried out by the project team, it has been difficult to implement preferential treatment for women in the restitution process as intended.

The first challenge is to make women claim land. Through special information campaigns and collaboration with gender-focused NGOs, the URT is attempting to get women, especially heads of household, to come forward to claim land that belonged to the household. This has proven difficult because both men and women in the countryside normally consider agriculture to be a male activity, and see land as being the property of men. For instance, a widow might not even know the exact locality of the parcel or the position of its boundaries. Weaker connection to the land also makes it harder for women to overcome the psychological barriers involved in returning to areas where they may have experienced horrendous atrocities. However, the few available figures on the content of the land restitution rulings indicate reasonable success in reaching out to women (see below).

The three selection criteria for micro-focalization security, concentration of cases and economic viability of return are not directly related to gender. The concentration of potential female applicants could have been an additional selection criteria for micro-focalization, e.g. the number of widows, for example proxy by the number of recorded male deaths, would *de facto* put women first in line to be included in the process if such is the aim of the policy

It is also difficult to prioritize women in the administrative phase due to the practical implementation of tasks in the micro-focalized areas. The URT finds it more time efficient to include all claimants in one identified area before they moving to the next. Selecting women first, and then men, would imply more travelling for the institutions involved and hence a loss of valuable work-time.

However, informants indicate that the URT and other institutions involved in formalization do make greater efforts to help women compared to men in similar situations, as well as seeking to help the most vulnerable – who tend to be women. Actually, the degree of gender awareness has increased in most of the Colombian state administration in general. For example, INCODER previously often adjudicated land only to male applicants; today they would immediately ask about any female partner to be included on the title deed with joint ownership.

The URT normally represents women, as well as male applicants, at the judicial phase. Our informants expressed that the URT had high gender awareness and willingness to use resources to help women. Furthermore, that restitution judges and restitution magistrates are trained to take into consideration the special circumstances that affect women, both as claimants and partners to be jointly titled with male claimants. The top-down signal from URT and SNARIV to prioritize women seems to have trickled down to people working on the ground. However, the need for the local URT offices to meet annual targets as to number of land parcels might lead them to prioritize male claimants, as these tend to be better informed about the property being claimed.

One paradox found during implementation, is that even in those cases where a parcel is owned by a couple, the law presumes to be only *one* claimant; which is usually a man. Various actors perceive this as an unreasonable practice that reduces gender equality, and have proposed innovative, practical ways to bypass this situation. Local URT offices may formally register a given parcel as two separate claims, one for the husband, the other for the wife. In processing the claims, these two are administratively treated as one property. While this creative solution makes women more visible, it also increases the number of claimants to the same property.

Women are also supposed to receive preferential treatment and more attention in the post-ruling/follow-up stage. Land restitution is only part of the comprehensive package of measures involving court rulings.

The claimants and their families can be entitled to individual help, such as education, psychological assistance, or productive projects, or collective benefits like the provision of infrastructure. There is no information available on the gender perspective in such assistance. However, respondents stress that measure to make returning a viable enterprise, for example productive projects, would assist more profitable agricultural activity which is culturally dominated by men.

Whether the URT has been successful in identifying potential female claimants and convincing them to register is difficult to assess, as we do not know the distribution of potential claimants. However, as many as 40% of the 54,063 claims for land restitution registered by 31 December 2013 were made by women (URT, 2014). However, the URT annual report does not indicate how many female claims were accepted in the RTDAF or later actually given a title.

Joint titling between applicant and the spouse at the time when they abandoned the land is another important gender equalizing policy. It seems reasonable to assume that most of the 40 percent female claimants are widows and hence without a male spouse with whom to share the land title. On the other hand, most of the 60 percent male claimants do probably have a spouse. SismaMujer (2014) refers to URT statistics which indicate that for all claims involving the claimant's spouse, 72 percent are made by men and 28 percent by women (unfortunately, the number of total claims is not known). The URT is reported to put considerable effort into identifying female companions, whether they are still in the household or have formed a separate household, in order to issue joint property rights. A partial review of early court cases indicates that half of the parcels are given a joint title, a quarter individual titling and a fifth is restituted to an undefined group of inheritors of the deceased original rights-holder.⁴ A woman is normally the main beneficiary, but the restitution judges implicitly grant rights to children, parents and other family members.⁵ The explicit distribution is to be decided later.

Gender outcomes are difficult to identify in statistics based on settled land restitution cases published by URT. According to URT informants, about 3500 individuals have so far benefitted from restitution, 49 percent of these being women and 51 percent men. While judge's order joint titling in 90 percent of the court decisions, this figure might encompass different types of households and include several family members. The extent of imposed joint titling and co-ownership between husband and wife at the moment of displacement is still unknown.

One possible explanation for the rather high share of land titling to women mentioned above is that the URT chose to start with land reform farms that were handed over to poor peasants in the 1960–70s after

⁴ The residual are smaller categories.

⁵ The cases of orphaned children are normally put in this category.

land occupations. INCORA, and later INCODER, often issued joint ownership in these cases and both spouses hence recognise their dual ownership rights today. It can be expected that there will be less acceptance of joint property rights as the restitution programme proceeds with more cases where land was inherited and brought into the family by one spouse alone.

The Victims' Law establishes preferential treatment for women. URT informants express concern about the lack of explicit regulations applicable to the paragraphs addressing this during the restitution process as well as concerning joint titling. Accordingly, the law's general approach in this matter leaves preferential treatment up to the interpretation of local URT offices and individual judges. Judges tend to be conservative when it comes to establishing the rights of women, often requesting explicit, material proof of a marital relation to the man. Since many couples were never officially married, a formal marital connection is hard to establish. Men and women may have changed partners after displacement, and may even lack formal identity papers; The URT puts great effort to demonstrate the contribution of the woman in farming, taking care of the family or her participation in other economic activities to contributing to the family livelihood. When such contribution is acknowledged at the court, the judges tends approve property rights to the woman either through joint titling or by splitting the land into two properties with both the man and the woman as owners if they no longer constitute a single household. The preferential treatment seems to be more a question of differences in knowledge and ability, both on the part of restitution authorities as well as women claimants, rather than gender per se. One example is the tendency for women not to be able to give the exact position and demarcation of the parcel. The URT hence often rely on the social mapping exercise to prove land right for women whose men died or disappeared during the conflict, e.g. in practise the neighbours indications are taken at face value.

Idiosyncratic interpretations, however, seem to play a major role in final court decisions. URT informants inform that some male occupant restitution claimants are titled individually in spite of the clear rule of joint titling when state land is adjudicated to households. On the other hand, many judges establish joint titling for individually owned land (*bien propio*), brought into marriage or inherited, in contradiction to the partial common property rights (*gananciales*) clause of the Civil Code. There have been cases where the judge grants monetary compensation to the woman for "improvements to the land while living together" when outright property rights are not admitted.

Specific effects for women

Fear and psychological effects: The return of IDPs to their original homes is held as the ultimate aim of the land restitution process. The rural population have lived very difficult lives during the conflict. Direct intimidation or a specific act of violence made people pack all their belonging and flee, often overnight,

driven by fear. These fears, or feelings of insecurity, remain vivid in their minds, overriding the urge to return – especially for women. The men, as the principal agriculturalists in Colombian households, are more connected to the land itself and may often be more willing to take risks.

Some quantitative surveys indicate that few IDPs actually want to return. CCPPDF (2008) found that only 3.1% of the respondents actually wanted to return. Part of the explanation is probably that IDPs who farmed on marginal land on the agricultural frontier had not developed deep family roots in the colonizing areas that were most affected (Saffon 2010). They would gladly accept compensation or replacement land somewhere else.

Survey results

RDS methodology and survey construction

Internally Displaced People (IDP) represents a so-called hidden population. There is no complete registry of the IDP, and a large share of them would resist identification and request for interviews if one apply conventional household surveys methodology. Snowball sampling is one possible solution to both identify respondents and persuade them to take part, e.g. asking some initial respondents within this population to identify friends, family and acquaintances with the same hidden population characteristic with request of interviews on behalf of the researchers. Furthermore, normal methodologies of quantitative analysis would probably give biased results as such selection would not be representative of the whole population. Salganik and Heckathorn (2004) developed the Respondent Driven Sampling (RDS) methodology which makes it possible to calculate unbiased incidence of a given variable in such snowball sampling datasets.

We identified the initial group of IDP respondents in round 0 through NGOs which works closely with this hidden population. The contacted IDPs by these initial respondents represent round 1 and are supposed to recruit new respondents for round 2. The more rounds of “new” IDPs that have not be included in preceding rounds by other respondents are collected, the shorter will the estimated confidence interval of the estimated variables be. The rounds can be illustrated as a tree with different branches that are split in each round. Some branches are dead ends as the respondent are not able to recruit new IDP within his network, while other branches can last for several rounds before it stops. The main reasons for stopping are that the respondents are not really willing to recruit new IDPs, have a limited network or the one suggested are already included in the survey by others. The participants are given a small amount of

money to participate in the survey, and furthermore some money per new IDP recruited to the following round.

We expect IDPs with claims in areas where restitution have started would be reasonably informed about the process and have considered their options. We hence restrict our universe to IDPs with property, possession or rightful claim (tenants excluded) in a municipality where parts of the territory have already been micro-focalized. The land restitution institutions would then have been in the area both collecting information and informing people on the process to come. We expect IDPs living outside the municipality to be informed. The micro-focalized zones normally cover a share of the municipality, but the URT intends to continue with the rest as soon as they have finalized the process the first group. People seldom know the exact borders of the micro-focalized zones, while they identify closely with the municipality as a territorial unit. The enumerators would hence easily verify if the new IDPs identified by a respondent belonged to our universe by checking a complete list of municipalities with micro-focalized zones published by URT.

Certain characteristics of the hidden population are required if a RDS sample should be representative of the hidden population and hence produce unbiased estimates. Heckathorn indicates that the social bonds between the IDPs should be frequent and reciprocal and constitute a convex group, e.g. there can possibly be a connection between any member of the group. Such would not be present at national level, and the RDS methodology is hence not suitable to calculate national figures. We hence concentrated our investigation to the two city regions of Barranquilla and Bogota including municipalities close by. Our universes of respondents on which we make inferences are IDPs living in or within a few hours drive by car from each other in these two city regions and have a rightful claim to land restitution in any part of the country

Most conventional surveys today are stratified and weighted with the population to produce unbiased estimates for the chosen universe. The RDS methodology uses a similar, although more sophisticated, mathematical technique. It estimates proportions of respondents of the total universe and the corresponding confidence interval of respondents of the total universe (Salganik y Heckathorn, 2004). The following analysis is often based on variables that are constructed by combining different questions from the survey in order to identify gender differences. Due to the cross-continental collaboration in this project between Norway and Colombia, do I not at this moment in time have the means to calculate the weighted percentages using the RDS technique but rather report figures from the unweighted survey sample. Gutierrez Sanin (2014) report the correctly weighted average for some of our variables, and by comparing some of them I fortunately find they do not differ that much, e.g. they report that 86.13 percent of

the sample fear repeated displacement compared to 84.37 percent in my unweighted sample (see table 17). All variables will be weighted in the next version of the article which will be presented at the conference in March.

RDS studies traditionally only report incidences of categorical variables, e.g. the share of households with respectively 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 or more parcels to be claimed in restitution. However, our interest is to know whether such differs between types of households, e.g. whether consists of only woman, only man or couple. Members of the Land observatory research group that took part in this survey have developed a way of calculating unbiased correlation coefficients. The methodology will be documented in future publications.

The survey is rich in detailed information and I will hence also report tables with average figures based on continuous variables, e.g. parcel size, on the unweighted survey population without any claim of being representative of the whole universe. Furthermore, it is also interesting to know certain characteristics of subpopulations, e.g. share of households with only woman that had a spouse before they became IDPs and the reason behind that will be given in such non-representative tables.

RDS Results

Gender categories of interest

Table 1 about here

There are more female than male respondents in the sample, 271 vs. 228 of the 499 observations (table 1). The gender of the respondent in itself is however only relevant if the perceptions given are not affected by his or her family composition. This is normally not the case. We hence chose two typologies to report responses from the survey. First, we split between households in which the responsible adult is woman without spouse (Woman HH), a man without spouse (Man HH) and a couple (Couple HH). There figures are respectively 27, 19 and 53 percent of the household observations. We do hence not differentiate on other household characteristics, e.g. number of household members, geography, etc. We then consider that the responses given reflect the situation of the household as a unit rather than the gender of the respondent.

For other questions the response might reflect the individual characteristic of the respondent rather than the household. We would then divide the Couple HH category into two categories, household with male respondent (Couple HH Man) and female respondent (Couple HH Woman). The latter is slightly larger with 27 percent of the sample compared to 26 percent of the former. The Woman HH and Man HH remains identical as all Woman HH respondents are women and all Man HH respondents are men.

Household composition

Table 2 about here

The average number of household members differs a lot between the household categories with 2.6 in Man HH, 4.7 in Woman HH and 5.6 in Couple HH (table 2). To our surprise, a large number of men live alone, 55 percent of Man HH, while such is very rare for women, less than 5 percent for Woman HH. Men appear to become lonely individuals when they split from their family through displacement, while women keep the responsibility for both children and elderly.

Table 3 about here

Qualitative studies indicate that displacement often leads to family break up. We find that 40 percent of our sample had spouse before and after displacement (table 3). However, the spouse only differed in 5 percentage point of those. On the other side, 21 percent of the sample had spouse before displacement but not now. This implies that of 42 percent of the 309 household that had spouse before displacement lost husband and remained single.

Table 4 about here

The reasons for losing the original spouse natural death in 11 percent of the households, 15 percent died an unnatural death and 25 percent live in another household (table 4). The gender difference is clear, female respondents said their husband had died unnaturally in 28 percent of the cases while the similar figure for male respondents were only 3 percent. This verifies that men rather than women got killed in the conflict.

Table 5 about here

Table 6 about here

The literacy rate is rather high, as only 13 percent of the respondents do not know how to read or write (table 5). 12 percent of them say they have not had any formal education (table 6). About 50 percent of respondents have at least completed primary education but the most repeated level of education in our sample was “incomplete primary education”. It is worth to note that 12 percent of single women have technical upper secondary education and 20 percent of single men have secondary education. Anyhow, education seems to be rather equal by gender.

Land

Table 7 about here

The respondents are reasonably well informed about the existence of the restitution program, nearly 80 percent for the whole sample (table 7), although male respondents are marginally general better informed than female respondents in all household categories.

Table 8 about here

Man HH indicates to have far more land with right to restitution than both Woman HH and Couple HH, respectively 53 hectares (HA), 11 HA and 23 HA (table 2). The mean for the whole sample is 25 HA, the maximum amount of land is 1000 HA and only 7 percent of the households as more than one parcel. Most IDPs in our survey are hence smallholders with one parcel of land, and our detailed questions for the most important parcel hence covers nearly the total land agricultural area. About 89 percent of the respondents say they have a single plot in the micro-focused areas (table 8). Although we do not observe great differences between men and women, the relative amount of couples who say to have 2 plots is twice as big as the relative amount of single people. We find 7 more cases with 3 plots, 1 married man with 4 and married woman with 6.

Table 9 about here

True ownership is more common than expected as 48 percent report to be owners, e.g. title deed in their own name registered in the own name, 25 percent possessors, e.g. title deed exist but not in their name, and only 8 percent occupants without any or documentation that carries less judicial weight (table 9). Women are only marginally more vulnerable to informality since ownership for Woman HH is 40 percent compared to 43 and 54 percent for their male and couple counterparts.

Table 10 about here

Table 11 about here

In a separate question we ask about the existence of any documentation of type of land rights Woman HH is worst of with 45 percent, compared to 53 percent and 58 percent for respectively their male and couple counterparts (table 10). It turns out that most of these documents were proper titles registered in the Public Registry, something which implies that undocumented occupancy is not as common as suspected (table 11).

Table 12 about here

Independent of land right type, it seems like women are less likely to claim land restitution as the response by couple HH differs by the sex of the respondent. 44 percent of Couple HH Woman compared to 33 percent of Couple HH Man does not want to apply for restitution (table 12). The gender difference is even higher for single households as the rate for Woman HH increases to 54 percent compared to 33 percent for Man HH. One interpretation is that women are in general more reluctant to return, and are able to influence their spouses not to return.

Table 13 about here

Table 14 about here

A majority of 62 percent the 275 households that claim to have sought or willingness to seek restitution has not started the process and we find the same gender pattern where women turn out to be least involved (table 13). Only 9 cases, or the tiny share of 3.1 percent of these willing households, have actually entered or ended the judicial phase and as much as 7 are actually Men HH. So there are mostly men among the few that have been able to reach this stage of the process. We also find that men are overwhelmingly the actual registered responsible claimant if the household have entered the restitution process. In Woman HH 37 percent is not the woman herself, while the similar figure for Man HH is 14 percent (table 14). Other relatives are important in Couple HH, probably offspring as the original members has grown old.

Return

Table 15 about here

Restitution is about right to the land, to reclaim what was lost, and there is no precondition for the displaced to return. The wish for return depend both on the household conditions and the sex of the respondent as the couple has seldom reached a joint agreement on what to do in the future. Personal perceptions of the respondent hence matters. We find that 16 percent of the Woman HH want to return compared to 37 percent for Man HH, similarly 24 percent for Couple HH Woman compared to 33 percent for Couple HH Man (table 15).

There is also a gender difference on the intention to actually use the land themselves, something which implicitly require presence and is hence linked to return. There is a huge gender difference for single headed households, e.g. 43 percent of Woman HH vs. 28 percent of Man HH want to sell the land, while it is slightly the other way for couples, e.g. only 36 percent of Couple HH Woman vs. 43 percent Couple HH Man. We can only speculate about the reason, e.g. maybe the respondent woman does not want to provoke their husband by stating she wants to sell the land.

Table 16 about here

37 percent of the 275 HH who intend to claim restitution would sell the land as soon as possible and only 36 percent 3 would keep it to farm themselves (table 16). Only 100 of the 499 HH, or 20 percent, state any interest in using the land, and reduced to 72 HH if combined with stated willingness to return to original household, e.g. less than 15 percent of the sample of potential benefactors of land restitution. Of these nearly half has not taken any initiative to actually register a restitution claim and thereby stating a real interest, something which reduces the likely return HH to less than 10 percent of the people URT would actually approach and work with in the restitution process, there is furthermore a large female discrepancy, e.g. 1.5 percent for Woman HH, 9.3 percent for Man HH and 10.5 percent for Couple HH. Woman HH would several practical reasons if they returned to their original parcels Agriculture is

considered male activity in Colombia and male dominated. Returning to rural areas without a husband or male protector in the household is probably not viable for single mothers.

Table 17 about here

Table 18 about here

IDPs were often forced to flee nearly by definition, otherwise they would be considered migrants. An overwhelming 84 percent of all household fear they would experience a similar situation in the future (table 17). The survey question is however ambiguous, and we do not whether they fear displacement at the current location or if they returned to their original residence. The enumerators indicate respondents made the first interpretation and are consistent with the high level of general insecurity sensed by 60 percent of the respondents (table 18).

Table 19 about here

Some sort of violence was reported to be the reason for leaving the plot in the first place as nobody indicated economic reasons to leave it. 23 percent of all household due to the general sense of risk in the area (women higher incidence than men), 50 percent after direct threats and 27 percent forcefully evicted (table 19).

Table 20 about here

Table 21 about here

It is important to feel strong and inspired to entail in the rather laborious task of rebuilding a future in the original place. Unfortunately, more women than men report to be sick (table 20), and considerably more women than men report to feel lonely (table 21). Interaction with government officials is vital, and their relationship with such is hence important.

Table 22 about here

There is no major difference between men and woman when it come to the ease of interacting with government officials, but it seems like Man HH and Woman HH find this more difficult than Couple HH (table 22).

As previously shown, women have fewer plots than men and their property rights are weaker. Women have hence less to gain economically by returning.

Joint titling

Table 23 about here

Table 24 about here

The Victims' Law require all land to be titled jointly, independent of former ownership. This contradicts the spirit of the family law which imply all inherited property and property acquired before marriage to remain individual property in contrast to property acquired while married that is jointly owned. Most of our respondents where such joint ownership is relevant tended to disagree. Of the 87 Couple HH intended to claim land restitution and actually indicate whom they would include in the title deed, 49 percent would include only respondent, 39 percent respondent and current spouse and 12 percent respondent and original spouse (table 23). The subgroup of 28 households where the respondent had inherited the land, 79 percent would only include themselves, 11 percent add the current spouse and 11 add the original spouse (table 24). If the latter is split by sex of the respondent, 91 percent of female respondents would only include themselves in contrast to 68 percent for their male counterparts. People hence tend to perceive the individual rights under the marriage law as stronger than the imposed joint property rights in the Victims' Law, even more strongly by women than men.

Gender roles

Table 25 about here

Colombia is considered a male dominated society. We asked both about norms and expectations regarding specific situations to disclose the gender culture. The results are mixed , implying gender equality in some situations and others not. For example, 91 percent of our sample thinks that women can go alone to the store (table 25). This percent goes down to around 88 percent when our respondent is a single or married man.

Table 26 about here

If we refer to more direct questions as whether the woman should obey the man however, our data reflects that most of respondents share the opinion that indeed women should obey men. There is one factor that seems to strengthen this view: to be married, increasing the percentages from 54 percent to 69 percent in the case of men, and from 50 percent to 64 percent in the case of women. We also can derive from this that this view is strongly shared by women but to a lesser extension than men (table 26).

Table 27 about here

It is of some interest also to observe the answers provided to the question "How should walk man and woman in the street?" The majority of the sample, 85 percent, thinks that women and spouse should walk side by side but an 8 percent thinks that men should walk in front and a 5 percent the other way around. If we pay attention to the group formed by single women the results are slightly different, increasing the amount of responses saying that the man should walk ahead up to 13 percent (table 27).

Table 28 about here

Another proxy for the role of women in the household, specially the financial role, can be observed by the share of respondents that agree with the statement “women should never make more money than men. In this case 89 percent of the sample disagrees, being the group of single men who reaches the higher percentage of disagreement with a 95 percent, and married men the lowest with an 87 percent (table 28).

Table 29 about here

Table 30 about here

The role that women play in the acquisition of goods by the household varies greatly on the kind of good or investment we refer to and the household category we put our focus on. Thus, we observe (table 29) how women have taken the initiative 52 percent of the times to buy school supplies. When the household head is a couple, 33 percent and 28 percent of man and women respectively say to have taken the initiative together, while only 30 percent of the married male respondent say to have taken himself the initiative, against the 59 percent of the married female respondent. When we ask who took the decision instead, percentages do not vary to a great extent, although we observe how men played a slightly bigger role in the decision process. The biggest change is for the married male respondents, where now a 37 percent claims having taken the decision themselves (table 30).

Table 31 about here

Table 32 about here

Related to the previous good is the initiative and decision of paying the children’s enrolment fee to school. When we refer to the initiative (table 31), we see how women, in spite of being the group that takes the initiative more often, lose some weight in favour of the “others” group. The fact that in the group “other” descendants are included might be the underlying reason of this change. Again, the answers about who took the decision (table 32) are consistent with those about the initiative, but the minor changes we observe are in favour of “other” instead of men as in the previous case.

Table 33 about here

Table 34 about here

In the case of the initiative for the 68 households that bought alcohol, 69 percent of those who took the initiative were men and when only 6 percent of married men say that the initiative was of the couple, the percentage goes up to 26 when asked the married women. In our sample, it seems that in most of the cases, those who took the initiative (table 33), made the decision (table 34).

Table 35 about here

Table 36 about here

To close the descriptive analysis of purchase initiative and decision, we look to “purchases in general”. In this case, initiative (table 35) corresponded to women 45 percent of times, men a 29 percent and the couples a 23 percent. Those who said that the initiative came from the couple more often were men and as expected, single respondents said the initiative was theirs most of the times making for a 78 percent in the case of men and 74 percent in the case of woman. It is noticeable that 70 percent of married women said the initiative was hers, in contrast to only a 34 percent of married men claiming the same. The decisions (table 36) are again taken in most of the cases for those who had the initiative.

Therefore, we see how the initiative and decision seem to be linked for all the 4 previous cases and how for every good listed, with the exception of alcohol, the initiative and decision came most of time from a woman. Thus, the provision of the household was responsibility mainly of women and, with exception of alcohol, what is bought is the women decision. In what follows we look at the role that gender has on the different investments that a household must face.

Table 37 about here

Table 38 about here

The initiative to invest on housing plot is distributed equally for men and women in our sample with a 33 percent each one (table 37). However, when we look at the answer by sex of the respondent we see how, independently of the sex, respondent say he has taken the decision himself in approximately 60 percent of the cases when married and 66 when single. When we talk about the decision men made the final decision a 37 percent (table 38) . In absolute numbers this is only one more man, but given the small size of household investing on a housing plot of our sample, the relative change looks bigger.

Table 39 about here

Table 40 about here

20 respondents of our sample invested on housing. Of these respondents, 20 percent said that was by the man’s initiative and 50 percent by the woman’s initiative and 60 percent of married men said was by initiative of the couple (table 39). When it comes to the decision however, men took the decision 30 percent of times (table 40).

Table 41 about here

Table 42 about here

The initiative to invest on material (table 41) was in 36 percent of occasions from a woman and 27 percent of times from a man. However, within households headed by a couple, the initiative came most of the times from the couple or the men. In the decision process however (table 42), there were as many respondents that said that was women's decision as respondents that said it was men's. Within couples, most of the times were the man who took the decision, followed by the couples and finally only the woman.

Table 43 about here

Table 44 about here

The initiative (table 43) and decision (table 44) about investment of furniture show a more traditional pattern. The initiative came from the woman 36 percent of times against 27 percent of times that came from men. However the decision was taken by the man in 35 percent of the households. If we look only to households formed by couples, the couple as a whole had the initiative most often, followed by the men and finally the women, but the decision was most of the times, taken by the man.

Table 45 about here

Table 46 about here

Finally, if we take a look to who had the initiative to buy a cart or animals from transport (Table 45), we see that men were 53 percent who took the initiative, and to an even large extent were who decided if the investment should be done or not (table 46).

From the analysis of the answers about household investment, we observe how in our sample men take more decisions than they did about the purchase of goods. In the case of couples, were the men who usually decided if the investment was to be done or not, even if the initiative came from women.

In conclusion, there is some degree of duality when it comes to gender roles. On one hand, 60 percent of respondents and over 65 percent if we talk about married respondents, think that women should obey men (table 36). On the other hand, women play a more important role in financial issues and most of times they take both the initiative and have the final say about where the money should be spent on (table 36). In this direction points also the fact that most respondents (i.e. 89 percent of the sample, 95 percent if we refer to single man), disagree with the claim that "women should never make more money than men" (table 28).

Conclusions

Colombia's land restitution process is moving forward slowly. The comprehensive documentation of each individual case and resources required for the courts will make it impossible to help the more than 5 million IDPs (Gutierrez

Sanin, 2013). A large proportion of the IDPs will probably never benefit from the restitution process, or perhaps the government will be forced to give monetary compensations, often based on collective judicial processes, instead.

If, contrary to expectations, the URT is able to reach all IDPs and formalize their property rights in the process, one may still question whether the state apparatus is strong enough to defend these rights later. The institutional presence in the countryside is weak, and vulnerable to pressure and corrupt practices that may undermine the achievements. Furthermore, land formalization processes tend to become single episodes of titling and the creation of a registry that is not updated afterwards. If information on land sales, inheritance and other transfers is not updated in the Public Registry because the actors feel the process is too complicated, time- and money-consuming, the registry will soon lose relevance.

Restitution of land does not necessarily mean that the IDPs will move back. A generation might have passed since they lost their land, and they may have now settled down in other areas, earning a living in other professions than agriculture. Their offspring often have no relationship to the area their parents left and will probably not consider relocating when they inherit the land. Preliminary fieldwork indicates three possible outcomes as the most common: the land remains idle; the land is used solely for recreational purposes; or the land is sold as soon as the two years of embargo have passed. In the course of our fieldwork we have not encountered any returning IDPs who have actually resettled on their original land. Those who take up farming again do so by migrating seasonally to conduct the farm work.

Our qualitative study survey indicates that both gender policies that should secure the rights for women to land do not necessarily work according to the intention. Our qualitative informants indicate that URT find it difficult to give women differential and preferential treatment as the restitution process considers all claimants within the small micro-focalized zone more or less at the same time. The URT are furthermore not able to target women specifically to make them claim land restitution. Our survey indicate that women are nearly as well informed on the restitution process as men and do not have less formal resources like education than their male counterparts. However, women do show considerably less willingness to claim land restitution, use the land themselves and return to the place of origin. The qualitative informants indicate women are less connected to the land and furthermore more traumatized by the experience of displacement than men. Our sample data verifies to a minor degree this gender difference in traumatisation.

Informality of land rights is considered one of the drivers of conflict in Colombia. Surprisingly, nearly half the sample report to be owners and number households lacking any documentation is rather low. Many have inherited the land, and we find that a majority such resists the inclusion of the spouse on the title deed, women actually more than men. This illustrates that people adhere to the civil law that states individual property rights in such cases rather than the joint ownership between the spouses as indicated in the Victims' Law. Wisely, to avoid resistance and discrediting the restitution process, the government has yet not introduced an explicit regulation of the Victims' Law that imposes such joint ownership in all circumstances. It is hence left to the land restitution judges to decide, and our qualitative informants indicate that they stick to the civil law when the plot is previously titled in only one of the

spouses' name. However, if informality reigns, joint land ownership is normally imposed even if such land might also be "inherited" by one of the spouses.

References

- COHDES (2010) '¿Consolidación de qué? Informe sobre desplazamiento, conflicto armado y derechos humanos en Colombia en 2010' (Consolidation of what? Report on displacement, armed conflict and human rights in Colombia in 2010), *CODHES Informa*, No 77, 15 February, Bogotá.
- García-Godos, J. & Wiig, H. (2014). The Colombian land restitution process - Process, results and challenges, with special emphasis on women. *Report*. Oslo: NIBR http://www.colombialandgender.org/images/pdf/GGW_2014_Land.pdf
- Gutiérrez Sanín, F. (2013). Un trancón fenomenal - Un análisis de las demoras en el proceso de restitución [A gigantic bottleneck – An analysis of the delays in the restitution process], Working paper, Land Restitution Observatory, Bogota.
- Gutierrez Sanín (2014) La restitucion y sus problemas segun sus potenciales beneficiarios (The restitution and its problems as perceived by potential beneficiaries): Observatorio de Restitucion y regulacion de derechos de propiedad agraria
- Heckathorn, M. (1997). Respondent driven sampling. A new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social problems*.
- IDP Commission (2010) III Encuesta nacional de verificacion de los derechos de la poblacion desplazada 2010 - Resumen de resultados preliminares en materia de bienes rurales (III National census on the verification of the rights tot he displaced people - Resume of the preliminary findings for rurales goods). Bogota: Commission for the follow up of the puplic policy for enforced displacement
- Saffon M. P. (2010). The project of land restitution in Colombia: An illustration of the civilizing force of hypocrisy. *Estudios Socio-juridicos*, 12 (2): 109-194
- Salganik, M. J. & Heckathorn, M. (2004). Sampling and Estimation in Hidden Populations Using Respondent-Driven Sampling *Sociological Methodology*.
- Wiig, H. (2013). Joint titling in Rural Peru: Impact on Women's participation in Household Decision-Making. *World Development*, 52 (1): 104-119
- Wiig, H. (2009). Compensation or restitution of land rights in the Colombian peacemaking process – Economic efficiency vs. society building? *Working Paper 119*. Oslo: NIBR. <http://www.nibr.no/filer/2009-119.pdf>

Tables

Appendix

Table 1. Household head composition, split by sex of respondent

HH category	sex of the respondent		Total
	man	woman	
Man HH	96 42.11	0 0.00	96 19.24
Woman HH	0 0.00	135 49.82	135 27.05
Couple HH	132 57.89	136 50.18	268 53.71
Total	228 100.00	271 100.00	499 100.00

Table 1 explication: The household categories in vertical axis with households with single man (Man HH), households with single woman (Woman HH), households with couple (Couple HH), combined with sex of respondent in horizontal axis. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 2. Summary table of quantitative figures

Man HH Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
# Family members	96	2.614583	2.381374	1	11
# Area of plots	96	52.77299	131.7383	0	1000

Mean, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum of family members and hectares of plots for households in which the respondent is a single man. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Woman HH Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
# Family members	135	4.77037	2.308132	1	14
# Area of plots	135	11.03022	22.41069	0	143

Mean, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum of family members and hectares of plots for households in which the respondent is a single women. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Couple HH Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
# Family members	268	5.593284	2.505924	1	16
# Area of plots	268	22.52724	49.06007	0	409

Mean, Standard deviation, minimum and maximum of family members and hectares of plots for households in which the respondent is married currently. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Number of single men in households with one member:
53

Number of single women in households with one member:
6

Table 3: Couple now and before displacement

Dummy for respondent having or not spouse	Dummy for respondent having spouse before displacement		Total
	yes	no	
yes	203 40.68	65 13.03	268 53.71
no	106 21.24	125 25.05	231 46.29
Total	309 61.92	190 38.08	499 100.00

Table 3 explication: A dummy for whether the respondent is currently married or not stands in the vertical axis combined with a dummy for whether the respondent was married originally or not in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 4: Reason for losing spouse, by current household status

Reason for the lost spouse to be lost	Having lost spouse has new spouse?		Total
	Changed spouse	Have no spouse	
Missing	0 0.00	4 3.77	4 3.08
Natural death	1 4.17	13 12.26	14 10.77
Unnatural death	5 20.83	15 14.15	20 15.38
Moved out (part of the HH)	0 0.00	7 6.60	7 5.38
Moved out (out of HH)	8 33.33	24 22.64	32 24.62
Other	10 41.67	43 40.57	53 40.77
Total	24 100.00	106 100.00	130 100.00

Table 4 explication: (Group: Those who lost their original spouse.) The reasons for which the spouse were lost according to respondents are listed in the vertical axis combined with those that lost their original spouse and have currently a new spouse (Changed spouse) and those that lost their original spouse and are currently single (Have no spouse). In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 5. Alphabetization by gender and HH category.

Respondent knows how to read and write	Respondent gender and HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH Woman	
yes	76 81.72	109 81.95	110 84.62	115 86.47	410 83.84	
no	17 18.28	24 18.05	20 15.38	18 13.53	79 16.16	
Total	93 100.00	133 100.00	130 100.00	133 100.00	489 100.00	

Table 5 explication: (Group: All respondents, excluded those that did not answer if they could read and write.) A dummy for whether respondent knows how to read and write or not stands in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 6. Education of respondent, by gender and HH category.

Level of education of the respondent	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
None	16 16.84	18 13.43	16 12.21	12 8.89	62 12.53
Primary, incomplete	18 18.95	28 20.90	32 24.43	34 25.19	112 22.63
Primary	19 20.00	24 17.91	19 14.50	22 16.30	84 16.97
Secondary, incomplete	15 15.79	31 23.13	24 18.32	37 27.41	107 21.62
Secondary	19 20.00	16 11.94	22 16.79	22 16.30	79 15.96
Upper Secondary, Tech	3 3.16	17 12.69	8 6.11	4 2.96	32 6.46
Universitary, incomp.	2 2.11	0 0.00	8 6.11	3 2.22	13 2.63
Universitary	3 3.16	0 0.00	2 1.53	1 0.74	6 1.21
Total	95 100.00	134 100.00	131 100.00	135 100.00	495 100.00

Table 6 explication: (Group: All respondents, excluded those that did not respond to which was their education.) Respondents' level of education in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 7: Knowledge of restitution program by sex of respondent and HH composition

Respondent knows about the restitution program	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
Missing	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.76	3 2.21	4 0.80
yes	76 79.17	96 71.11	112 84.85	107 78.68	391 78.36
no	20 20.83	39 28.89	19 14.39	26 19.12	104 20.84
Total	96 100.00	135 100.00	132 100.00	136 100.00	499 100.00

Table 7 explication: Dummy for whether the respondent says to know about the restitution program in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single

man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 8. Number of plots by gender and HH category.

number of plots or parcels	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
1	87 90.63	125 92.59	114 86.36	116 85.29	442 88.58
2	5 5.21	9 6.67	17 12.88	17 12.50	48 9.62
3	4 4.17	1 0.74	0 0.00	2 1.47	7 1.40
4	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.76	0 0.00	1 0.20
6	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 0.74	1 0.20
Total	96 100.00	135 100.00	132 100.00	136 100.00	499 100.00

Table 8 explication: The number of plots or parcels the respondents say to have in the micro-focused-area in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 9: Rights to land, by HH-category

Relation of ownership to the plot	HH Category			Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	
Missing	2 2.08	1 0.74	2 0.75	5 1.00
Owner	42 43.75	55 40.74	145 54.10	242 48.50
Occupant	10 10.42	13 9.63	18 6.72	41 8.22
Possessor	23 23.96	42 31.11	62 23.13	127 25.45
Tenant	0 0.00	1 0.74	0 0.00	1 0.20
Other	19 19.79	23 17.04	41 15.30	83 16.63
Total	96 100.00	135 100.00	268 100.00	499 100.00

Table 9 Explication: The legal relationship of the respondent to the main plot in the vertical axis combined with households with single man (Man HH), households with single woman (Woman HH), households with couple (Couple HH) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 10: Existence of document of land rights, by HH category

Dummy for existing documents of property	HH Category			Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	
Missing	2 2.08	1 0.74	3 1.12	6 1.20
yes	51 53.13	62 45.93	155 57.84	268 53.71
no	43 44.79	72 53.33	110 41.04	225 45.09
Total	96 100.00	135 100.00	268 100.00	499 100.00

Table 10 explication: Dummy for existing documents of property for the main plot combined with households with single man (Man HH), households with single woman (Woman HH), households with couple (Couple HH) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 11: If land rights documented, share as property in Public Registry

Dummy for existing documents of property	Dummy for documents being registered at ORIP			Total
	Missing	yes	no	
Missing	6 100.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	6 100.00
yes	17 6.34	214 79.85	37 13.81	268 100.00
no	47 20.89	0 0.00	178 79.11	225 100.00
Total	70 14.03	214 42.89	215 43.09	499 100.00

Table 11 explication: Dummy for respondent saying that there are documents of property for the main plot in the vertical axis combined with the documents being registered at the ORIP in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 12: Intention to request land restitution and return, by HH category

Respondent gender in HH category	Intention to apply and to come back to plot				Total
	Missing	No apply	Back	No Back	
Man HH	18 18.75	31 32.29	29 30.21	18 18.75	96 100.00
Woman HH	21 15.56	74 54.81	13 9.63	27 20.00	135 100.00
Couple HH Man	15 11.36	43 32.58	34 25.76	40 30.30	132 100.00
Couple HH Woman	16 11.76	60 44.12	28 20.59	32 23.53	136 100.00
Total	70	208	104	117	499

14.03 41.68 20.84 23.45 | 100.00

Table 12 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with whether they do not want to apply (No apply), have applied or plan to apply (Apply Back) or have applied or plan to apply and not coming back (No Back). In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 13: Stage in restitution process for signalled willingness to apply, by HH category

How advanced is the restitu. application?	HH Category			Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	
Missing	2 3.33	1 1.85	7 4.35	10 3.64
Finish legal process	2 3.33	0 0.00	0 0.00	2 0.73
In legal proceedings	5 8.33	1 1.85	1 0.62	7 2.55
Pending of URT	10 16.67	8 14.81	24 14.91	42 15.27
Applied to URT	7 11.67	7 12.96	30 18.63	44 16.00
Not started	34 56.67	37 68.52	99 61.49	170 61.82
Total	60 100.00	54 100.00	161 100.00	275 100.00

Table 13 explication: (Group: Those who have applied or plan to apply to the restitution programme) How advanced is the restitution programme combined with households with single man (Man HH), households with single woman (Woman HH), households with couple (Couple HH) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 14: Individual made the responsible claimant if HH has entered the restitution process, by HH category

Who applied to restitution program	HH Category			Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	
Woman	0 0.00	10 62.50	0 0.00	10 18.52
Man	18 85.71	0 0.00	0 0.00	18 33.33
Husband	0 0.00	0 0.00	3 17.65	3 5.56
Descendant	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 5.88	1 1.85
Other relatives	2 9.52	4 25.00	9 52.94	15 27.78
Other	1 4.76	2 12.50	4 23.53	7 12.96
Total	21 100.00	16 100.00	17 100.00	54 100.00

Table 14 explication: (Group: Those who have applied or plan to start, that have not finished the legal proceedings) Who applied to the restitution program in the vertical axis combined with households with single man (Man HH), households with single woman (Woman HH), households with couple (Couple HH) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 15: Intention to return, by sex of respondent and HH category

Dummy for planning to return to plot	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
yes	37 38.54	21 15.56	49 37.12	33 24.26	140 28.06
no	59 61.46	114 84.44	83 62.88	103 75.74	359 71.94
Total	96 100.00	135 100.00	132 100.00	136 100.00	499 100.00

Table 15 explication: Dummy for whether the respondents plan to come back to the plot or not in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 16: Plans with plot if restituted, by HH category

Respondent gender in HH category	Which plans do you have for the plot if restituted?						Other	Total
	Missing	Lease lan	Farming a	farming a	Stay away	Sell it		
Man HH	5 8.33	0 0.00	28 46.67	1 1.67	1 1.67	17 28.33	8 13.33	60 100.00
Woman HH	8 14.81	3 5.56	12 22.22	1 1.85	1 1.85	23 42.59	6 11.11	54 100.00
Couple HH Man	8 9.20	3 3.45	34 39.08	0 0.00	1 1.15	36 41.38	5 5.75	87 100.00
Couple HH Woman	8 10.81	4 5.41	26 35.14	2 2.70	1 1.35	27 36.49	6 8.11	74 100.00
Total	29 10.55	10 3.64	100 36.36	4 1.45	4 1.45	103 37.45	25 9.09	275 100.00

Label list:

- 1 Lease lan: Lease land to others
- 2 Farming a: Farming and having animals of my own
- 3 farming a: farming and having animals of a relative
- 4 Stay away: Stay away because others are there
- 5 Sell it: Sell the plot
- 6 Other

Table 16 explication: (Group: those that have applied or plan to apply for restitution) Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with the plan the respondent have for the plot if it was restituted. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 17: Feeling fear of repeated displacement, by HH and respondent category

Respondent gender in HH category	Afraid of having to abandon residence for conflict again			Total
	0	yes	no	
Man HH	0 0.00	78 81.25	18 18.75	96 100.00

Woman HH	0	119	16	135
	0.00	88.15	11.85	100.00
Couple HH Man	0	112	20	132
	0.00	84.85	15.15	100.00
Couple HH Woman	1	112	23	136
	0.74	82.35	16.91	100.00
Total	1	421	77	499
	0.20	84.37	15.43	100.00

Table 17 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with whether they are afraid about having to leave again for a conflict. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 18: Feeling fear in general, by HH and respondent category

Respondent gender in HH category	Variable for feeling fear				Total
	Missing	yes	no	sometimes	
Man HH	0	52	44	0	96
	0.00	54.17	45.83	0.00	100.00
Woman HH	4	85	46	0	135
	2.96	62.96	34.07	0.00	100.00
Couple HH Man	1	71	59	1	132
	0.76	53.79	44.70	0.76	100.00
Couple HH Woman	3	87	46	0	136
	2.21	63.97	33.82	0.00	100.00
Total	8	295	195	1	499
	1.60	59.12	39.08	0.20	100.00

Table 18 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with whether they feel fear in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 19: Reason for abandoning plot, by respondent household category

Respondent gender in HH category	Reasons to leave plot				Total
	0	Abandoned	Threats	Forced ou	
Man HH	1	13	53	29	96
	1.04	13.54	55.21	30.21	100.00
Woman HH	0	31	67	37	135
	0.00	22.96	49.63	27.41	100.00
Couple HH Man	0	30	68	34	132
	0.00	22.73	51.52	25.76	100.00
Couple HH Woman	1	38	64	33	136
	0.74	27.94	47.06	24.26	100.00
Total	2	112	252	133	499
	0.40	22.44	50.50	26.65	100.00

Label list:

1 Abandoned: Abandoned for fear, violent acts in neighbourhood

- 2 Threats
- 3 Forced out: Forced out

Table 19 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with the reasons that made the respondents to leave the plot. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 20: Respondent being sick, by respondent household category

Respondent gender in HH category	Dummy for having been sick last year			Total
	Missing	yes	no	
Man HH	2 2.08	52 54.17	42 43.75	96 100.00
Woman HH	1 0.74	95 70.37	39 28.89	135 100.00
Couple HH Man	2 1.52	72 54.55	58 43.94	132 100.00
Couple HH Woman	2 1.47	85 62.50	49 36.03	136 100.00
Total	7 1.40	304 60.92	188 37.68	499 100.00

Table 20 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with whether the respondent has been sick the last year in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 21: Respondent feeling lonely, by respondent household category

Respondent gender in HH category	Dummy for feeling loneliness			Total
	0	yes	no	
Man HH	0 0.00	67 69.79	29 30.21	96 100.00
Woman HH	2 1.48	103 76.30	30 22.22	135 100.00
Couple HH Man	1 0.76	62 46.97	69 52.27	132 100.00
Couple HH Women	0 0.00	85 62.50	51 37.50	136 100.00
Total	3 0.60	317 63.53	179 35.87	499 100.00

Table 21 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with whether the respondent feels loneliness in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 22: Ease of interaction with government, by respondent household category

Respondent gender in HH category	Is it easy to interact with gov. officials?				Total
	Missing	yes	no	don't know	

Man HH	1	38	46	11	96
	1.04	39.58	47.92	11.46	100.00
Woman HH	0	62	63	10	135
	0.00	45.93	46.67	7.41	100.00
Couple HH Man	1	38	88	5	132
	0.76	28.79	66.67	3.79	100.00
Couple HH Woman	1	40	89	6	136
	0.74	29.41	65.44	4.41	100.00
Total	3	178	286	32	499
	0.60	35.67	57.31	6.41	100.00

Table 22 explication: Respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the vertical axis combined with whether the respondent think is easy to interact with officials from the government or not in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 23: Persons include in title, by way of obtaining plot, only Couple HH restitution claim and exclude if title persons inclusion is missing and "other" category.

How was obtained the plot	People that respondent plans to include in application			Total
	Me	Current	Original	
Missing	0	1	0	1
	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Bought/got with spous	6	8	1	15
	40.00	53.33	6.67	100.00
Bought by respondant	1	1	0	2
	50.00	50.00	0.00	100.00
Bought by spouse befo	2	0	0	2
	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Inherited by spouse	1	1	5	7
	14.29	14.29	71.43	100.00
Inherited by responda	22	3	3	28
	78.57	10.71	10.71	100.00
Inherited by responda	0	0	1	1
	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00
Spouse's parents gave	0	4	0	4
	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
Respondant's parents	1	2	0	3
	33.33	66.67	0.00	100.00
Other	10	14	0	24
	41.67	58.33	0.00	100.00
Total	43	34	10	87
	49.43	39.08	11.49	100.00

Label List

- 1 Me: Only me
- 2 Current: Current spouse
- 3 Original: Original spouse
- 4 Bought/got with spous: Bought/got with spouse
- 5 Bought by respondant: Bought by respondant before joining spouse
- 6 Bought by spouse befo: Bought by spouse before joining respondant

- 7 Bought by respondent's parents
- 8 Bought the allotment and built on it
- 9 Inherited by spouse
- 10 Inherited by responde: Inherited by respondent
- 11 Inherited by respondent after joining spouse
- 12 Spouse's parents gave: Spouse's parents gave it to respondent and spouse
- 13 Respondant's parents: Respondant's parents gave it to respondent and spouse
- 14 Other

Table 23 explication: (Group: Those that have applied or plan to apply and are currently in a couple) How was the main plot obtained in the vertical axis combined with who is he planning to include at the restitution process application in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 24 Who included in title by gender of respondent, if land inherited by respondent in Couple HH

sex of the respondent	People that respondent plans to include in application			Total
	Me	Current	Original	
man	11 68.75	2 12.50	3 18.75	16 100.00
woman	11 91.67	1 8.33	0 0.00	12 100.00
Total	22 78.57	3 10.71	3 10.71	28 100.00

Label List

- 1 Me: Only me
- 2 Current: Current spouse
- 3 Original: Original spouse

Table 24 explication: Sex of the respondent of in vertical axis combined with who it is planning to include at the restitution process application in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the row. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 25. Woman going alone to store, by sex and HH type, exclude 0

Can women go alone to the store?	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
yes	77 88.51	118 92.91	117 89.31	125 92.59	437 91.04
no	10 11.49	9 7.09	14 10.69	10 7.41	43 8.96
Total	87 100.00	127 100.00	131 100.00	135 100.00	480 100.00

Table 25 explication: (Group: All respondents, excluded those that not answered whether a woman can go alone to the store or not) Dummy for whether a woman can go alone to the store or not in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 26. Woman should obey man excluded missing, by sex and HH type.

Should |

women obey the man?	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
yes	49 54.44	67 50.38	89 68.99	86 64.18	291 59.88
no	41 45.56	66 49.62	40 31.01	48 35.82	195 40.12
Total	90 100.00	133 100.00	129 100.00	134 100.00	486 100.00

Table 26 explication: (Group: All respondents, excluded those that not answered whether a women should obey men or not) Dummy about whether respondent thinks a women should obey men or not combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 27. Gender norms of public appearance in street, by sex and HH type.

How should walk woman and spouse together?	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
Side by side	67 90.54	84 84.00	109 83.85	116 85.93	376 85.65
Woman in front	4 5.41	3 3.00	10 7.69	7 5.19	24 5.47
Man in front	3 4.05	13 13.00	11 8.46	12 8.89	39 8.88
Total	74 100.00	100 100.00	130 100.00	135 100.00	439 100.00

Table 27 explication:(Group: All respondents, excluded those that did not answer how should a couple walk in the street) How should a woman and her spouse walk together in the street in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 28. Women never make more money than men excluded missing, by sex and HH type.

Women should NEVER make more money than men	Respondent gender in HH category				Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman	
I agree	4 4.44	14 10.77	17 12.88	16 11.94	51 10.49
I disagree	86 95.56	116 89.23	115 87.12	118 88.06	435 89.51
Total	90 100.00	130 100.00	132 100.00	134 100.00	486 100.00

Table 28 explication: (Group: All respondents, excluded those did not answer to the question if they disagree with women should never make more money than men) Whether respondents agree or disagree with the statement that women should never make more money than men in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 29. Initiative to buy school supplies, excluded missing, by HH category.

who had INITIATIVE school	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	24 70.59	2 2.82	21 30.88	6 7.14	53 20.62	
Woman	3 8.82	64 90.14	17 25.00	50 59.52	134 52.14	
Both/couple	3 8.82	2 2.82	23 33.82	24 28.57	52 20.23	
Other	4 11.76	3 4.23	7 10.29	4 4.76	18 7.00	
Total	34 100.00	71 100.00	68 100.00	84 100.00	257 100.00	

Table 29 explication: (Group: Those that bought school supplies, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to buy the school supplies in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 30. Decision to buy school supplies, excluded missing, by HH category

who took DECISION school	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	25 73.53	1 1.43	25 37.31	8 9.52	59 23.14	
Woman	3 8.82	62 88.57	17 25.37	50 59.52	132 51.76	
Both/couple	3 8.82	6 8.57	21 31.34	21 25.00	51 20.00	
Other	3 8.82	1 1.43	4 5.97	5 5.95	13 5.10	
Total	34 100.00	70 100.00	67 100.00	84 100.00	255 100.00	

Table 30 explication: (Group: Those that bought school supplies, excluded missing) Who made the decision to buy the school supplies in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 31. Initiative to pay fee children school, excluded missing, by HH category.

who had INITIATIVE fee	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	8 66.67	1 6.25	8 36.36	0 0.00	17 21.25	
Woman	1 8.33	14 87.50	4 18.18	16 53.33	35 43.75	
Both/couple	1 8.33	1 6.25	9 40.91	13 43.33	24 30.00	

Other	2	0	1	1	4
	16.67	0.00	4.55	3.33	5.00
Total	12	16	22	30	80
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 31 explication: (Group: Those that paid the enrolment fee for children's education, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to pay the enrolment fee for children's education in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 32. Decision to pay fee children school, excluded missing, by HH category.

who took DECISION fee	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	9	1	5	1	16	
	75.00	6.25	22.73	3.33	20.00	
Woman	1	13	5	14	33	
	8.33	81.25	22.73	46.67	41.25	
Both/couple	1	2	10	13	26	
	8.33	12.50	45.45	43.33	32.50	
Other	1	0	2	2	5	
	8.33	0.00	9.09	6.67	6.25	
Total	12	16	22	30	80	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Table 32 explication: (Group: Those that paid the enrolment fee for children's education, excluded missing) Who made the decision to pay the enrolment fee for children's education in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 33. Initiative to buy alcohol, excluded missing, by HH category

who had INITIATIVE alcohol	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	18	0	26	3	47	
	94.74	0.00	86.67	20.00	69.12	
Woman	0	4	2	7	13	
	0.00	100.00	6.67	46.67	19.12	
Both/couple	0	0	2	4	6	
	0.00	0.00	6.67	26.67	8.82	
Other	1	0	0	1	2	
	5.26	0.00	0.00	6.67	2.94	
Total	19	4	30	15	68	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Table 33 explication: (Group: Those that bought alcohol, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to buy the alcohol in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 34. Decision to buy alcohol, excluded missing, by HH category.

who took DECISION alcohol	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	18 94.74	0 0.00	25 86.21	3 20.00	46 68.66	
Woman	0 0.00	3 75.00	2 6.90	8 53.33	13 19.40	
Both/couple	0 0.00	1 25.00	2 6.90	4 26.67	7 10.45	
Other	1 5.26	0 0.00	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 1.49	
Total	19 100.00	4 100.00	29 100.00	15 100.00	67 100.00	

Table 34 explication: (Group: Those that bought alcohol, excluded missing) Who made the decision to buy alcohol in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 35. Initiative to purchase in general, excluded missing, by HH category.

who had INITIATIVE general	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	32 78.05	10 13.51	27 34.18	8 10.96	77 28.84	
Woman	2 4.88	55 74.32	13 16.46	51 69.86	121 45.32	
Both/couple	6 14.63	7 9.46	37 46.84	13 17.81	63 23.60	
other	1 2.44	2 2.70	2 2.53	1 1.37	6 2.25	
Total	41 100.00	74 100.00	79 100.00	73 100.00	267 100.00	

Table 35 explication: (Group: Those that bought things in general, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to buy things in general in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 36. Decision to purchase in general, excluded missing, by HH category.

who took DECISION general	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	31 75.61	3 4.11	25 32.47	9 12.50	68 25.86	
Woman	1 2.44	57 78.08	16 20.78	49 68.06	123 46.77	
Both/couple	6 14.63	11 15.07	35 45.45	13 18.06	65 24.71	

Other	3	2	1	1	7
	7.32	2.74	1.30	1.39	2.66
Total	41	73	77	72	263
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 36 explication: (Group: Those that bought things in general, excluded missing) Who made the decision to buy things in general in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 37. Initiative investing lote for house, excluded missing, by HH category

who had INITIATIVE lote	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	2	0	5	1	8	
	66.67	0.00	62.50	10.00	33.33	
Woman	0	2	0	6	8	
	0.00	66.67	0.00	60.00	33.33	
Both/couple	1	1	2	2	6	
	33.33	33.33	25.00	20.00	25.00	
Other	0	0	1	1	2	
	0.00	0.00	12.50	10.00	8.33	
Total	3	3	8	10	24	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Table 37 explication: (Group: Those that invested on a lote for the house, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to invest on a lote for the house in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 38. Decision investing lote for house, excluded missing, by HH category

who took DECISION lote	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	2	0	5	2	9	
	66.67	0.00	62.50	20.00	37.50	
Woman	0	3	1	4	8	
	0.00	100.00	12.50	40.00	33.33	
Both/couple	1	0	2	3	6	
	33.33	0.00	25.00	30.00	25.00	
Other	0	0	0	1	1	
	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	4.17	
Total	3	3	8	10	24	
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	

Table 38 explication: (Group: Those that invested on a lote for the house, excluded missing) Who decided to invest on a lote for the house in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 39. Initiative to invest in housing, excluded missing, by HH category

who had INITIATIVE house	Respondent gender in HH category						Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH	Woman	
Man	1 50.00	0 0.00		2 40.00		1 11.11	4 20.00
Woman	0 0.00	4 100.00		0 0.00		6 66.67	10 50.00
Both/couple	1 50.00	0 0.00		3 60.00		2 22.22	6 30.00
Total	2 100.00	4 100.00		5 100.00		9 100.00	20 100.00

Table 39 explication: (Group: Those that invested on a housing, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to invest on housing in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 40. Decision to invest in housing, excluded missing, by HH category

who took DECISION house	Respondent gender in HH category						Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH	Woman	
Man	1 50.00	0 0.00		3 60.00		2 22.22	6 30.00
Woman	0 0.00	4 100.00		0 0.00		5 55.56	9 45.00
Both/couple	0 0.00	0 0.00		2 40.00		2 22.22	4 20.00
Other	1 50.00	0 0.00		0 0.00		0 0.00	1 5.00
Total	2 100.00	4 100.00		5 100.00		9 100.00	20 100.00

Table 40 explication: (Group: Those that invested on housing, excluded missing) Who decided to invest on a housing in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 41. Initiative to invest in materials, excluded missing, by HH category

who had INITIATIVE material	Respondent gender in HH category						Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH	Woman	
Man	5 62.50	1 6.67		12 57.14		1 4.17	19 27.94
Woman	1 12.50	13 86.67		0 0.00		11 45.83	25 36.76
Both/couple	1 12.50	1 6.67		6 28.57		12 50.00	20 29.41
Other	1 12.50	0 0.00		3 14.29		0 0.00	4 5.88

Total	8	15	21	24	68
	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 41 explication: (Group: Those that invested on material for the house, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to invest on material for the house in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 42. Decision to invest in materials, excluded missing, by HH category

who took DECISION material	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	5 62.50	2 13.33	16 76.19	1 4.17	24 35.29	
Woman	2 25.00	12 80.00	1 4.76	9 37.50	24 35.29	
Both/couple	0 0.00	1 6.67	1 4.76	14 58.33	16 23.53	
Other	1 12.50	0 0.00	3 14.29	0 0.00	4 5.88	
Total	8 100.00	15 100.00	21 100.00	24 100.00	68 100.00	

Table 42 explication: (Group: Those that invested on materials for the house, excluded missing) Who decided to invest on materials for the house in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 43. Initiative to invest on furniture, excluded missing, excluded missing, by HH category

who had INITIATIVE furniture	Respondent gender in HH category					Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH Man	Couple HH Woman		
Man	7 70.00	0 0.00	5 31.25	1 11.11	13 33.33	
Woman	0 0.00	3 75.00	6 37.50	5 55.56	14 35.90	
Both/couple	1 10.00	1 25.00	4 25.00	3 33.33	9 23.08	
Other	2 20.00	0 0.00	1 6.25	0 0.00	3 7.69	
Total	10 100.00	4 100.00	16 100.00	9 100.00	39 100.00	

Table 43 explication: (Group: Those that invested on a furniture, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to invest on furniture in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 44. Decision to invest on furniture, excluded missing, excluded missing, by HH category

who took |

DECISION furniture	Respondent gender in HH category						Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH	Woman	
Man	8 80.00	0 0.00		9 56.25		1 11.11	18 46.15
Woman	0 0.00	3 75.00		3 18.75		4 44.44	10 25.64
Both/couple	1 10.00	1 25.00		4 25.00		4 44.44	10 25.64
Other	1 10.00	0 0.00		0 0.00		0 0.00	1 2.56
Total	10 100.00	4 100.00		16 100.00		9 100.00	39 100.00

Table 44 explication: (Group: Those that invested on furniture, excluded missing) Who decided to invest on furniture in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 45. Initiative to invest on cart, excluded missing by HH category

who had INITIATIVE transport	Respondent gender in HH category						Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH	Woman	
Man	2 100.00	0 0.00		2 66.67		3 42.86	7 53.85
Woman	0 0.00	1 100.00		0 0.00		3 42.86	4 30.77
Both/couple	0 0.00	0 0.00		1 33.33		0 0.00	1 7.69
Other	0 0.00	0 0.00		0 0.00		1 14.29	1 7.69
Total	2 100.00	1 100.00		3 100.00		7 100.00	13 100.00

Table 45 explication: (Group: Those that invested on a cart or animals for transport, excluded missing) Who took the initiative to invest on a cart or animals for transport in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.

Table 46. Decision to invest on a cart, excluded missing, by HH category.

who took DECISION transport	Respondent gender in HH category						Total
	Man HH	Woman HH	Couple HH	Man	Couple HH	Woman	
Man	1 100.00	0 0.00		2 66.67		4 57.14	7 58.33
Woman	0 0.00	1 100.00		0 0.00		3 42.86	4 33.33
Both/couple	0 0.00	0 0.00		1 33.33		0 0.00	1 8.33
Total	1 100.00	1 100.00		3 100.00		7 100.00	12 100.00

Table 462 explication: (Group: Those that invested on a cart or animals for transport, excluded missing) Who decided to invest on a cart or animals for transport in the vertical axis combined with the respondents' genders by household category (Man HH: single man, Woman HH: single woman, Couple HH Man: married man, Couple HH Woman = married woman) in the horizontal axis. In every cell we have absolute number and its percentage over the total in the column. Source: ColombiaLandGender RDS household survey.