A Local Governance Survey in the Philippines:

Mayor Version

Kenichi NISHIMURA (Osaka University)

1 Overview of the Survey

This paper presents the results of a local elite survey of local governments in the Philippines as part of the project entitled "Local Government Survey in Southeast Asia: Comparative Research on Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines" (Principal Investigator: Nagai Fumio). The project was supported by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Kakenhi Grant Number 21252003 (FY2009-2012). The aim of this project was to perform a comparative analysis of the extent of decentralization and the impact of the autonomy of local governments on local governance and the performance of local governments in the three countries abovementioned.

The project members began preparatory work in 2009, including making drafts of questionnaires, conducting pretests, and revising questionnaires based on the results of the pretests.[1] Through repetition of this process, we finalized the questionnaires for the mayor and the city/municipal planning and development coordinator in the summer of 2011. We conducted pretests with the utmost care because this was the first large-scale elite survey of both local chief executives and high-ranking officials of local government units (LGUs) in the Philippines. We selected 20 LGUs based on region, fiscal class, and urban/rural categories, and conducted pretests at two different times in 2010. We found, through these pretests, that it is necessary to limit the length of the interviews to 20 minutes or less due to the local chief executives' busy schedules. Based upon these findings, we carefully selected questions to reduce the volume of the questionnaires.

We performed a series of consultations with a public opinion social research institute in the Philippines (Social Weather Stations: SWS). Including these preparatory work on the questionnaires, we also consulted SWS on the survey methodology itself. At first,

we explored the possibility of a postal mail survey. However, considering the postal conditions in the Philippines, we decided to conduct a face-to-face interview survey instead. We held several meetings with SWS to work out the details of the survey methodology because SWS did not have extensive experience in conducting this type of elite survey, although they had considerable experience with mass surveys.

Using systemic random sampling, we selected 300 municipalities/cities in 16 regions across 70 provinces among the total 1,515 municipalities/cities in 16 regions and 78 provinces in the country (as of March 1, 2011). We excluded the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) due to its political instability. The sample consisted of 93 cities and 207 municipalities: 170 governments in Luzon, 67 in Visayas, and 63 in Mindanao.

Interviews were commissioned to SWS and conducted with individual mayors and planning and development coordinators in each LGU. Interviews of the mayors were conducted from November 12, 2011 to November 27, 2012 and interviews of the planning and development coordinators were conducted from October 12, 2011 to April 19, 2012. The response rates were 100% for both mayors and planning and development coordinators.

From the next section, we present the results of a simple tabulation of data on mayors as well as planning and development coordinators. For some questions with multiple answers, the total frequencies exceed the sample size (300). We took 300 as the denominator, however, to indicate the percentage of LGUs that chose the answers among the total 300 LGUs.

2   Survey Results of Mayors

The Local Government Code of 1991 (LGC 1991) expanded the powers and authorities as well as the financial bases of LGUs, thus enhancing their autonomy. It also promoted the participation of the private sector and local population through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and people's organizations (POs) in the local policy process. It is important to analyze the effects of these institutional changes on the governance of mayors. With these issues in mind, we asked the mayors about (1) policy input, (2) relationship with constituents, (3) networks with other governmental institutions, and (4) opinions about local governance, along with their individual attributes.

2.1 Policy Input

Mayors in the Philippines have been said to occupy a pivotal position in the policy-making process of LGUs. However, there are few empirical studies that explain exactly how mayors take initiatives to make policies. Therefore, we asked the mayors from whom they most often obtained ideas for projects in the environmental sector and infrastructure. The results showed that the first choice was the "mayor him/herself" for both project categories (environmental projects 56.0%, infrastructure 59.3%), followed by "barangay captains" (environmental projects 30.3%, infrastructure 36.0%), and "officials in LGUs" (environmental projects 30.3%, infrastructure 33.3%). On the other hand, only a small number of mayors chose NGOs, POs, or businesspeople as a source of ideas for new projects. In the case of environmental projects, "NGOs" was 12.3%, "POs" was 5.7%, and "businesspeople" was 4.0%. In the case of infrastructure, "NGOs" was 2.3%, "POs" was 2.0%, and "businesspeople" was 5.3%. Interestingly, common local residents were chosen more frequently, as high as 22.7% for environmental projects and 21.7% for infrastructure.

These results indicate that mayors usually initiate the policy-making process and that they place importance on traditional networks for making policies such as networks of local government officials and barangay captains. On the other hand, we can see from the results that there are some occasions for local residents to give input about their aspirations directly to the mayors.

Mayors' beliefs on the main role of local development councils (LDCs) also indicated that mayors attach weight to their own ideas for new policies and projects. An LDC is an institute that promotes participation of local citizens in the process of development planning within LGUs in the Philippines. The LGC 1991 required every LGU to establish an LDC and that NGO representatives shall constitute not less than one-fourth (1/4) of the total LDC members (LGC 1991: Sec. 106-115). The most important role of the LDC is, from the provisions, to reflect the opinions of NGOs and POs in the local development plans and investment programs. However, the most frequent answer to the question about the role of the LDC was that it is an "opportunity to secure support from the people for the mayor's priority projects," which accounted for 39.3% of the total answers.

However, the choices "opportunity to obtain ideas of projects from the people of NGOs or POs" and "opportunity to obtain ideas of projects from the barangay captain" were also relevant, as seen from the 27.3% and 25.7% shares in the responses, respectively. NGOs and POs were chosen more frequently than barangay captains as the source of ideas for new policies and projects. This fact appears to show the binding

effect of the LGC 1991 on mayors' beliefs on the role of LDCs as an institute for promoting the participation of local citizens in local development planning. The mayor of Quezon City once mentioned the importance of complying with the LGC 1991 when he established an LDC (Nishimura 2009).

A host of LGUs, including municipalities in rural areas, have suffered from weak fiscal situations despite the intentions of the LGC 1991's creators. We have observed in many cases that the Internal Revenue Allotment (IRA) from the central government cannot cover the budget deficit for development projects. Against this background, networks with other governmental institutions and political figures are important for mayors to secure financial resources.

Therefore, we asked mayors about whom they ask to provide financial support when revenue, including IRA and locally generated revenue, is not sufficient. We found that the governmental institutions or political figures that provide financial support regardless of the amount that were chosen most frequently was "congresspersons" (84.0%), followed by "provincial governors" (78.9%) [2] and "senators" (77.7%). "Congresspersons" and "provincial governors" were also chosen most often for providing "strong support" at 52.0% and 43.2%, respectively. [3] On the other hand, a significant percentage of financial support from "senators" (42.0%) was classified as "little support".

Why was there such a gap in financial support between congresspersons and senators? The first possible explanation is that each congressperson is close to the mayor because the former has a seat on the LDC. Second, congresspersons have a strong motivation to forge good relationships with the mayor for their next election because his/her electoral district has geographical proximity with the mayor. Senators, by contrast, have to cover a nation-wide constituency and therefore have difficulties providing "strong support" to all 1,600 LGUs across the country.

A significant number of mayors (44.3%) said they didn't receive any support from the president. This means, however, that more than half of mayors did have financial support from the president, including "strong support" and "moderate support" shares of 18.7% and 18.3%, respectively, and "little support" of 15.3%. This may be because the president recognizes the importance of securing political support from local politicians and tries to smoothen his/her policy implementation through providing direct financial support to the utmost number of mayors possible. In the case of "secretaries of the project related departments", there was considerable variation among mayors on the level of support, with "strong support" accounting for 17.0%, "moderate support" accounting for 31.7%, "little support" accounting for 25.7%, and "no support"

accounting for 23.3%. The fiscal size and population, among other factors, may affect this result. However, we still have to make a holistic analysis on this issue.

1-1. When you think of embarking on new projects in the environment sector, from whom do you obtain ideas most often? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yourself as Mayor	168	56.0
2. Municipal/City councilors	51	17.0
3. Barangay captains	91	30.3
4. Business persons	12	4.0
5. NGO	37	12.3
6. Local PO (Peoples Organization)	17	5.7
7. Officials from your LGU	91	30.3
8. Common local residents other than NGO & PO	68	22.7
9. Provincial government	2	0.7
10. National government	10	3.3
11. International Organization	1	0.3
12. Other government agencies*	2	0.7
13. Experts	8	2.7
14. Stake holders	4	1.3
15. Media	2	0.7
16. All (including the councils of multisector)	5	1.7

* Including one (1) past local administration

1-2. When you think of embarking on new projects of infrastructure, from whom do you obtain ideas most often? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yourself as Mayor	178	59.3
2. Municipal/City councilors	50	16.7
3. Barangay captains	108	36.0
4. Business persons	16	5.3
5. NGO	7	2.3
6. Local PO	6	2.0
7. Officials from your LGU	100	33.3
8. Common local residents other than NGO & PO	65	21.7
9. National government	6	3.0
10. Congressperson	2	0.7
11. International Organization	1	0.3
12. Other local government units	1	0.3
13. Experts	7	2.3
14. Stake holders	2	0.7
15. All (including the councils of multisector)	8	2.7

1-3. What do you think is the main role of the Local Development Council? (ONE ANSWER ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Opportunity to secure support from the people to your priority projects	118	39.3
2. Opportunity to obtain the ideas of projects from the Barangay Captains	77	25.7
3. Opportunity to obtain the ideas of projects from the people of NGO or PO	82	27.3
4. Opportunity to obtain the ideas of projects from the Barangay Captains and the people of NGO or PO	9	3.0
5. Opportunity for all members to consult and make decisions about development plan	4	1.3
6. Opportunity to check and identify necessary projects	7	2.3
7. Opportunity to obtain support for planning and finance from business	1	0.3
8. No Answer	2	0.7

1-4. If the amount of the revenue including IRA and locally generated revenue of your LGU isn't enough, which of the following did you ask to provide financial support in the past year? (Besides the normal procedure of forwarding a budget application form to the departments of the national government) Please answer each item

	Strong Support		Moderate Support		Little Support		No Support		Not Applicable		No Answer/ Refused	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
13. Governor (Ask only of LGUs outside NCR)	121	40.3	59	19.7	41	13.7	56	18.7	20	6.7	3	1.0
14. Congressmen	158	52.7	62	20.7	35	11.7	44	14.7	0	0.0	4	1.3
15. Senators	33	11.0	74	24.7	126	42.0	62	20.7	0	0.0	5	1.7
16. Secretaries of the project-related departments	53	17.7	95	31.7	78	26.0	70	23.3	0	0.0	7	2.3
17. President of the Philippines	56	18.7	55	18.3	46	15.3	133	44.3	0	0.0	11	3.7
18. International donor agencies/ countries	64	21.3	66	22.0	66	22.0	102	34.0	0	0.0	5	1.7
19. Private sector	90	30.0	87	29.0	68	22.7	67	22.3	0	0.0	3	1.0
20. National government agencies (other than the departments)	3	1.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
21. NGO/PO	1	0.3	8	2.7	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
22. Overseas hometowners	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
23. Schools	1	0.3	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
24. Media	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Note: Some answers are categorized multiply based on their contents.

2.2 Relationship with Constituents

Needless to say, linkage with constituents is important for a mayor who is directly elected by the people. This is especially true in the Philippines, which has a long history of democratic elections starting from the beginning of the 20th century. In addition, since the 1987 Constitution and LGC 1991 institutionalized the participation of the private sector, including NGOs and POs, in local governance, the relationship with constituents has become even more important for mayors. On the other hand, because the Philippine's local politics have resistant patron-client relationships and political/economic resources are usually captured by the political elites, mayors often have some prerogatives to control local constituents. Against this backdrop of the Philippine's local politics, we set up several questions to explore the relationship between mayors and their constituents.

First, we asked about the frequency of meeting with local constituents, including local-level politicians such as local assemblypersons or barangay captains. In the case of barangay captains, "several times a week" accounted for 46.3% of responses, "once a month" accounted for 19.7%, "once a week" accounted for 14.0%, and "2–3 times a month" accounted for 13.7%. As for local assemblypersons, 41.0% of mayors said they meet with them "several times a week", 34.3% meet with them "once a week", 9.7% meet with them "2–3 times a month," and 9.0% meet with them "once a month." The number of mayors who meet the local assemblypersons more than once a week was higher than the number who meet the barangay captains with the same frequency. The reason for this may be because it is difficult for some barangay captains to meet with mayors frequently because their barangays are located far from the city/municipal hall.

We next asked about the frequency of meetings with NGOs, local POs, civic groups such as the Rotary Club, and businesspeople. In the case of NGOs, the share of mayors who said they meet with them "once a month" was largest (25.7%), with "several times a year" following by a narrow margin (25.0%), then "2–3 times a month" (18.3%), "several times a week" (17.7%), and "once a week" (11.3%). For local POs, "once a month" accounted for 26.7%, "several times a year" followed at 24.3%, then "2–3 times a month" (18.0%), "several times a week" (16.3%), and "once a week" (12.7%). As for civic organizations, "several times a year" accounted for the greatest proportion at 29.7%, followed by "once a month" (21.3%), "none" (18.3%), "2–3 times a month" (12.3%), "several times a week" (9.3%), and "once a week" (8.0%). The reason that the proportion of mayors without contact with civic organizations is high may be that these groups are not formed unless the population and scale of the economy are at a certain level. Finally, in the case of businesspeople, "several times a year" accounted for the greatest proportion at 32.3%, "once a month" followed at 24.0%, then "several times a week" (15.0%), "2–3 times a month" (14.3%), "once a week" (8.3%), and "none" (5.3%).

Here, considering that civic organizations and businesspeople represent the elite strata of

the community while NGOs and POs represent the non-elite strata, we can see that mayors meet with non-elite members of the community more often than with elite members. While 73.0% of mayors said they meet NGOs more than once a month and 73.7% of them meet POs with the same frequency, mayors who meet with businesspeople with the same frequency was just 61.7%, and only 51.0% of them meet civic organizations more than once a month. The frequency of meeting with non-organized, common constituents was even higher. Mayors who meet with them several times a week was 60.3%, and mayors who meet them once a month accounted for 84.3%.

This tendency of non-elite members of the community to meet with the mayor more often than elite members is also reflected in the frequency that mayors attend NGO-sponsored and company-sponsored meetings. First, regarding the frequency of attendance at NGO-sponsored meetings, the percentage of "once a month" was the largest at 24.0%, followed by "2–3 times a month" and "less than once a month" (both 20.3%), "several times a week" (19.7%) and "once a week" (10.7%). In the case of the company-sponsored meetings, the percentage of "once a month" was the highest (28.3%), but "less than once a month" was only slightly different (28.0%). The proportion of mayors who attend a meeting "2–3 times a month" fell to 14.3%. Then, "several times a week" accounted for 12.7%, followed by "none" (8.3%) and "once a week" (5.7%).

As stated earlier, the proportion of mayors who attend company-sponsored meetings more than once a month at 61.0% was smaller than the proportion who attend NGO-sponsored meetings more than once a month at 74.7%. This may be because there are no corporate groups in small LGUs that do not have a certain scale of economy. Nonetheless, organizations representing non-elite members of the community are more frequently in contact with the mayor than organizations representing elite members. The institutionalization of POs and NGOs' participation in local autonomy may be a factor for these results, although other possible factors causing these phenomena need to be examined in detail.

Robert D. Putnam, in his 1993 book, *Making Democracy Work*, notes that civil society's active commitment to the public interest is important for improving the performance of local governments. Keeping this point in mind, we also asked about the topics of discussions between mayors and local constituents. Specifically, we asked mayors what topics they discuss most often with NGOs/POs and businesspeople. For NGOs and POs, "social issues in the municipality/city" was the topic discussed most frequently (57.0%), followed by "new projects of the LGU" (44.3%), and "new projects of the NGO/PO itself" (30.7%). For businesspeople, "social issues in the municipality/city" was the topic discussed most frequently (39.7%), followed by "new projects of the LGU" (32.3%), and "new ordinances" (31.3%). It was revealed that both NGOs/POs and businesspeople discuss topics concerning social issues in the municipality/city most often with the mayors. It is necessary to analyze in

more detail whether this result indicates that the same change that Putnam found in Italy is also seen in the Philippines.

2-1. How often do you meet the people listed below? (ONE ANSWER ONLY)

	Several times/ week		Once/ week		2–3 times/ month		Once/ month		Several times/ year		None		Others		No answer	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. Barangay captains	139	46.3	42	14.0	41	13.7	59	19.7	18	6.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
2. Municipal/ city councilors	123	41.0	103	34.3	29	9.7	27	9.0	16	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
3. Members of NGO	53	17.7	34	11.3	55	18.3	77	25.7	75	25.0	3	1.0	1	0.3	2	0.7
4. Members of local POs	49	16.3	38	12.7	54	18.0	80	26.7	73	24.3	4	1.3	1	0.3	1	0.3
5. Members of civic groups such as Rotary Club, etc.	28	9.3	24	8.0	37	12.3	64	21.3	89	29.7	55	18.3	1	0.3	2	0.7
6. People from business entities	45	15.0	25	8.3	43	14.3	72	24.0	97	32.3	16	5.3	1	0.3	1	0.3
7. Common residents except NGO, civic group & local PO	181	60.3	24	8.0	25	8.3	23	7.7	44	14.7	2	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.3

2-2. How often have you attended the meetings hosted by the organizations listed below in last year?

	Several times/week		Once/week		2–3 times/month		Once/week		Less than once/month		None		Others		No answer	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. NGO or PO	59	19.7	32	10.7	61	20.3	72	24.0	61	20.3	9	3.0	5	1.7	1	0.3
2. Business men's Group	38	12.7	17	5.7	43	14.3	85	28.3	84	28.0	25	8.3	7	2.3	1	0.3

2-3. What kind of topics do you most often discuss with the following organizations? (ALLOW TWO (2) ANSWERS ONLY)

	New projects of the LGU		New projects of the organization itself		Social issues in the municipality / city		Management issues of the LGU itself		New ordinances		Others (Please specify)	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. NGO or PO	133	44.3	92	30.7	171	57.0	45	15.0	31	10.3	26	8.7
2. Business-men's Group	97	32.3	72	24.0	119	39.7	77	25.7	94	31.3	27	9.0

2.3 Networks with other Governmental Institutions

The strength of a mayor's network with other governmental institutions and politicians may be one of the factors that affect the performance of LGUs. Therefore, we asked about the frequency of meetings with other governmental officials and politicians during the previous year. The politician whom the mayors said they met with most often was the congressperson in the same district. The number of mayors who responded that they met with the congressperson at least once a month reached 163 (54.3% of 300 mayors), including 113 mayors (37.7%) who responded that they met with him/her two or more times a month. Following the congressperson in the same district, mayors frequently met with the provincial governor (except the LGUs in the National Capital Region [NCR]). Excluding the mayors from the NCR, among the remaining 282 mayors, the number of those who responded that he/she met with the provincial governor at least once a month was 161 (57.1% of 282 mayors), including 97 mayors (34.4%) who met with the governor two or more times a month.

In contrast, in the case of party-list congresspersons, the number of mayors who replied that they met with them at least once a month was 49 (16.3% of 300 mayors). In the case of senators, the meeting frequency with mayors further declined and included only 23 mayors (7.7% of 300 mayors) who met with them at least once a month. For the president, only three mayors (1.0% of 300 mayors) answered that they meet with the president once a month, and nearly half (147 mayors, 49.0%) never met with the president. Similar tendencies with senators were seen for the secretaries and under-secretaries (USECs)[4] of departments of the national government. In the case of secretaries, 25 mayors (8.3% of 300 mayors) met with them at least once a month, and in the case of USECs, 23 mayors (7.7%) met with them at the same frequency.

As for the political networks within a city/municipality, the ones with barangay captains are especially important. This is because city/municipal development plans should be created while integrating the development plans of the barangays within the jurisdiction of each city/municipality and must maintain consistency with them. Therefore, we asked the mayors about the issues of frequent discussion with the barangay captains. We found that the topic discussed most often was "construction of roads/public buildings," which accounted for 51.7% of responses. Other topics varied from "peace and order" (32.0%), "health projects" (29.0%), "education" (24.7%), "environmental projects" (22.3%), and "livelihood projects" (21.3%). These results suggest that the mayors respond in accordance with the socioeconomic circumstances of each locality.

3-1. How often did you meet the people listed below in the past year?

	Not applicable		More than once / month		Once / month		Several times / year		Once/year		None		No answer / don't know	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. The Governor (except the LGUs in NCR)	18[*1]	6.0	97	32.3	64	21.3	83	27.7	8	2.7	27	9.0	3	1.0
2. The Congressman from my district	0	0.0	113	37.7	50	16.7	91	30.3	9	3.0	34	11.3	3	1.0
3. Party list congressmen	0	0.0	20	6.7	29	9.7	81	27.0	66	22.0	100	33.3	4	1.3
4. Senators	0	0.0	10	3.3	13	4.3	99	33.0	85	28.3	88	29.3	5	1.7
5. Undersecretaries of the departments	1[*2]	0.3	8	2.7	15	5.0	102	34.0	87	29.0	84	28.0	3	1.0
6. Secretaries of the departments	1[*2]	0.3	8	2.7	17	5.7	103	34.3	86	28.7	82	27.3	3	1.0
7. The president	1[*2]	0.3	0	0.0	3	1.0	63	21.0	83	27.7	147	49.0	3	1.0

*1 This item is not applicable for the local governments such as those within National Capital Region which are outside the jurisdiction of the province.

*2 There is no restriction placed on any local governments to making contact with the President, secretaries and under-secretaries of the departments. We, however, leave the answer "Not applicable" as it is.

3-2. Among the following issues what do you talk mostly with a Barangay captain? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Education	74	24.7
2. Construction of road / public buildings	155	51.7
3. Health projects	87	29.0
4. Environmental projects	67	22.3
5. Relocation of the people	8	2.7
6. Peace and order (ADR etc.)	96	32.0
7. Political matters	17	5.7
8. Livelihood projects	64	21.3
9. Barangay projects	8	2.7
10. Disaster preparedness	3	1.0
11. Agriculture	2	0.7
12. Moral issues	1	0.3
13. All from no.1 to no.8	4	1.3
14. Don't know	1	0.3

2.4 Opinions about Local Governance

The LGC 1991 aims, through decentralization, to democratize local governance and realize the efficient supply of effective public services. How each LGU attains these two goals is largely dependent on the beliefs of the mayors about local governance. Therefore, we included questions asking about mayors' beliefs on local governance in the questionnaire.

First, we asked the mayors' opinions, providing two choices, on what good local governance is. The first choice was "to implement projects with lower cost and faster speed" and the second was "to satisfy as much as the widest range of constituents regardless of the cost and speed of project implementation." We assumed that the mayors who chose the first option had an orientation to emphasize implementing an efficient administration under their own strong leadership. Mayors who chose the second choice were assumed to have a willingness to encourage people's participation and to accept the opinions and aspirations of the local population. The survey results indicated that leadership-oriented mayors accounted for 59.7% and participation-oriented mayors accounted for 40.3%. This can be said to be a reasonable result, considering that patron-client relationships tend to influence the relationship between politicians and their constituents, and also that a significant number of mayors have coercive control over constituents, utilizing economic, political, and state resources (Sidel 1999) under the cultural tradition of "machismo," that is, placing value on a masculine strength.

Next, we asked the mayors what they think is the most important element for good local governance. The ratio of respondents who chose "strong political will of the chief executive" was the highest (73.7%), followed by "to activate the participation of the local citizens" (68.7%). The next choice was "enhancement of the organizational capability of LGU," which accounted for 36.0%, while the proportion of mayors who chose "strengthening networks with other political figures such as congresspersons" was only 8.7%. Given the traditional image of local politicians, who are often criticized for building political dynasties and controlling local politics along with the state apparatus utilizing networks with other political figures, it is surprising that only a few mayors chose to strengthen networks with other political figures. This may be due to the influence of the philosophy of good governance promulgated in the LGU 1991 on these mayors when they answered the survey questions.

As indicated by the abovementioned answers, one important factor for good governance is to enhance the organizational capability of the LGU. The questionnaire, therefore, also asked about the mayors' ideas on the capabilities of the LGU's officials. First, we asked how often the LGU's staff participate in seminars and workshops provided by research and educational institutions such as the Local Development Academy.[5] The largest response was "less than 3 times a year" (32.7%), while "more than once a month" accounted for 27.0%. As described above, there were relatively large variations. With this background in mind, there may be several factors, including geographical conditions such as the distance of the LGU to the seminar venue or the size of LGU such as the number of government staff.

Then, we asked about the mayors' ideas regarding the capacities that they want their staff to acquire. We included this question to clarify the extent to which the recent global trend, including introducing the management methods of private enterprises that aim for more efficient and effective local public administration, is observed in the Philippines. Looking at the results, the most frequent answer was "professional skills required in each department/division" (54.0%). The next most frequent answer was "customer orientation, skills for dealing with citizens" (36.7%), followed by "management capacities for more strategic thinking" (34.7%) and "transparency management" (30.7%). On the other hand, only a small proportion of mayors expected their staff to acquire "management practices in private companies for more efficient business" (7.7%).

4-1. In your opinion, what is the good local governance? (ONE ANSWER ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. To implement projects with lower cost and faster speed	179	59.7
2. To satisfy as much as the widest range of constituents regardless of the cost and speed of project implementation	121	40.3

4-2. What do you think is the most important element for good governance? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Strong political will of the chief executive	221	73.7
2. To activate the people's participation	206	68.7
3. Enhancement of the organizational capability of LGU	108	36.0
4. Strengthening the network with other political figures such as congressman, etc.	26	8.7

4-3. On average, how often has your LGU sent your staff to the seminars/workshops offered by the Local Government Academy and other research / educational institutes?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. 3 times a year or less	98	32.7
2. Quarterly in a year	40	13.3
3. More than quarterly but less than once a month	70	23.3
4. Once to 3 times a month	60	20.0
5. Once a week or more	21	7.0
6. As needed	4	1.3
7. Anytime when there is an invitation	5	1.7
8. Not know	1	0.3

4-4. What kind of capacities do you want your staff to acquire most? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Basic Legal Competency/ Accounting Skills	30	10.0
2. Professional Skills required in each department/division	162	54.0
3. Management Capacities for more Strategic Thinking	104	34.7
4. Management Practices in Private Companies for more Efficient Business	23	7.7
5. Customer Orientation, Skills to deal with citizens	110	36.7
6. Civil Service / Professional Ethics	57	19.0
7. Transparency Management	92	30.7
8. Comprehensive capacity as a staff of local government	2	0.7

2.5 Personal Background

A mayor's professional experiences may have influence on their ideas of local governance. The performance of the LGU is also affected by the mayor's beliefs on local governance. With this point in mind, we asked the mayors about their previous occupations as well as the occupation in which they were engaged in longest. The results showed that "business owner" was chosen most frequently for both previous occupation and the occupation in which they were engaged the longest (60.0% and 40.3%, respectively), followed by "political elected official" (34.7% and 19.0%). "Land owner" was the third largest among all previous occupations (26.3%), and was the fourth largest in the occupation engaged in longest category (7.7%), after "civil government official other than police or military officer" (9.7%).

In the Philippines, where the large land ownership system is still strongly present, it has been customary for landowners to take elected political positions against the backdrop of economic power, and/or to support entrepreneurs belonging to the same elite circle who also become politicians. In addition, entrepreneurs are in a position to build a close relationship with the local political elite as bidders for public works projects. In other words, landlords, entrepreneurs, and politically elected officials such as mayors constitute a local elite stratum, and political control by them has been regarded as a characteristic of politics in the Philippines (Anderson 1988). This result may also be a reflection of such characteristics of politics in the Philippines.

Regarding the educational background of mayors, most hold bachelor's degrees, accounting for two-thirds of the total, with 90% of mayors having educational backgrounds at or above university graduation.

As for having experience as a politically elected official before being elected as mayor,

37.3% and 33.0% responded as being experienced in the positions of vice-mayor and local city/municipal councilor, respectively, while 24.0% answered that they had no such experience at all. This result indicates that, in many cases, those aspiring to become mayor acquire proficiency in administrative management in local governments to a certain extent before they run for mayor.

We then asked whether the mayor has any politicians among family and relatives. First, we asked the mayors if there are any persons among their relatives who currently occupy a politically elected position, including parents, brothers and sisters, sons and daughters (including all in-laws), uncles and aunts, nephews and nieces, and second cousins. The proportion of mayors whose brothers or sisters were in politically elected positions was the highest, accounting for one-third of respondents. On the other hand, the number of mayors whose parents were in politically elected positions was the smallest, accounting for less than 10%. In the Philippines, however, there are political families who produce a number of politicians across several generations regardless of it being national or local politics. Therefore, it was necessary to ask whether there were any politically elected officials over the generations. For this, we asked the mayors whether their parents or grandparents had any experience in a politically elected position in the past. We found that 56.3% of the mayors had parents or grandparents who had been elected to political office in the past. In the Philippines, as traditionally pointed out, it can be said that political families who produce politicians across generations tend to dominate local politics.

We then asked the mayors about their beliefs on elections. We first asked what they think is most effective for winning a local election. The most frequent answer was "integrity of the candidate," accounting for 62.3%, followed by "approachability to the constituency" (55.7%) and "political platform of the candidate" (44.3%). By contrast, only 17.0% of the mayors chose "visibility of the candidate". This result suggests that the mayors think that it is important to give constituents an image as patrons who reliably provide benefits in accordance with the request of the constituents.

We finally asked whose support the mayor thinks is most effective for winning a local election. The most frequently chosen response was barangay captain (62.7%), followed by NGOs/POs (39.0%) and the local population (25.3%). Traditionally, in the Philippines, community leaders with the power to mobilize votes play an important role in local elections. Today, however, barangay captains play their part, but the barangay system has already been consolidated. As for NGOs/POs, they have continued to develop throughout the 1980s and 1990s, and today, they are important players for community development. With their mobilizing power, they have become significant actors for the mayors. On the other hand, it is common in the Philippines for the political elite to organize NGOs and POs themselves with various intentions (Clarke 1998). In view of these points, we have to carefully examine the autonomy of NGOs and POs from the government.

5-1. 1. What was your occupation before becoming mayor? Please choose as many as applicable items?

5-1. 2. Please choose the occupation you had engaged in longest

	5-1. 1 (N=300)		5-1. 2 (N=300)	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. Business owner	186	62.0	121	40.3
2. Private Employee	59	19.7	22	7.3
3. Lawyer	25	8.3	11	3.7
4. Professional other than the lawyer	43	14.3	22	7.3
5. Police or Military officer	18	6.0	10	3.3
6. Other Civil Government official	57	19.0	29	9.7
7. Political Elected Official	104	34.7	57	19.0
8. NGO staff	11	3.7	1	0.3
9. Charitable activist	12	4.0	3	1.0
10. Land owner	79	26.3	23	7.7
11. Others (Please specify)	0	0.0	1	0.3

5-2. What is the highest level of education you have attained?

	Frequency	Ratio
0. Elementary	1	0.3
1. High school	9	3.0
2. Vocational course	4	1.3
3. Some bachelor	17	5.7
4. Bachelor's degree	202	67.3
5. Some master	8	2.7
6. Master's degree	40	13.3
7. Some doctor	3	1.0
8. Doctor's degree	16	5.3

5-3. What political positions did you have before you were elected as the mayor? (ALLOW MULTIPLE RESPONSE, N=300)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Barangay captain	27	9.0
2. Councilor of your LGU	99	33.0
3. Vice mayor	112	37.3
4. Provincial board member	24	8.0
5. Vice governor	6	2.0
6. Governor	5	1.7
7. Congressman	14	4.7
8. Mayor	24	8.0
9. Administrator of an LGU	6	2.0
10. Other politically elected position	12	4.0
11. Government official	12	4.0
12. Private citizen	72	24.0

5-4. How many of the members in your family / relatives are presently occupying politically elected positions? Please indicate the number of the people in each item

Number of People	Father / Mother (including in-law)		Brothers / Sisters (including in-law)		Uncles / Aunts		Sons / Daughters (including in-law)		Nephews / Nieces		Cousins (including 2nd degree cousins)	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
0	271	90.3	201	67.0	267	89.0	230	76.7	242	80.7	242	80.7
1	24	8.0	74	24.7	19	6.3	57	19.0	40	13.3	20	6.7
2	5	1.7	17	5.7	6	2.0	10	3.3	12	4.0	18	6.0
3	0	0.0	6	2.0	3	1.0	3	1.0	3	1.0	3	1.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	1	0.3	4	1.3
5	0	0.0	1	0.3	3	1.0	0	0.0	2	0.7	2	0.7
6	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	1.7
8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
10	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	0.7
15	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3
20	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.3

5-5. Did your grandfather/grandmother and/or father/mother ever occupy a politically elected position?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yes	169	56.3
2. No	131	43.7

5-6. In your view, what is the most effective factor among those factors listed below when it comes to winning an LGU Election? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Political Platform of the candidate	133	44.3
2. Approachability to the constituency	167	55.7
3. Visibility of the candidate	51	17.0
4. Integrity of the candidate	187	62.3
5. Track record of the candidate	9	3.0
6. Financial capability of the candidate	4	1.3
7. Trust of the people to the candidate	4	1.3
8.Political resource of the candidate	2	0.7
9. Political will of the candidate	2	0.7
10. Have faith in God	1	0.3

Note: We categorized open-ended questions for 5 to 10.

5-7. In your view, whose support is the most effective among those below when it comes to winning an LGU Election? (ALLOW TWO (2) RESPONSES ONLY)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. NGO、PO	117	39.0
2. Barangay captain	188	62.7
3. Governor	54	18.0
4. Congressman	44	14.7
5. Senator	0	0.0
6. President	11	3.7
7. Others	8	2.7
8. Common local residents	76	25.3
9. Political supporters	10	3.3
10. Family and relatives	8	2.7
11. None	2	0.7
No answer	3	1.0

5-9. Age

	Frequency	Ratio
30 and younger	10	3.3
31-35	9	3.0
36-40	32	10.7
41-45	30	10.0
46-50	50	16.7
51-55	51	17.0
56-60	39	13.0
61-65	36	12.0
66-70	24	8.0
71 and more	17	5.7
No answer	2	0.7

5-10. Sex

	Frequency	Ratio
Male	234	78.0
Female	66	22.0

3 Survey Results of the City/Municipal Planning and Development Coordinator

Local Development Councils

LGC 1991 regulates the establishment of Local Special Bodies (LSBs) for all LGUs in order to promote the participation of local citizens in local public administration. LGC 1991 provides for the establishment of a local development council (LDC) (Sec. 106-115), a local prequalification, bids, and awards committee (Sec. 37), a local school board (Sec. 98-101), a local health board (Sec. 102-105), and a local peace and order council (Sec. 116). In each LSB, a certain number of the members of a committee/council/board must come from the private sector including local NGOs and POs. Among these LSBs, the LDC is the institution most suitable for evaluating the state of the people's participation in local public administration as its role is related to the comprehensive development planning function, and as the size of the institution is rather large.

With this background in mind, we developed questions to clarify the actual situation regarding LDC management. The first of these questions was to confirm whether the LDC is administered as established by LGC 1991. We asked the city/municipal planning and development coordinators (C/MPDCs) whether the LDC of his/her LGU drafts a comprehensive development plan (annual, medium, or long-term) and/or a public

investment program (annual or medium-term). For both development plans and investment programs, we discovered that a decreasing proportion of LGUs formulated them as the planning period became longer. In the case of the development plans, we found that 97.0% of LGUs create an annual plan, followed by 91.0% that create a medium-term plan, and just 84.3% that create a long-term plan. As for the investment programs, 95.7% of LGUs develop an annual program and the number decreases to 82.3% that develop medium-term programs.

Next, we asked whether the LDC was composed of members as stipulated by law. Section 107 (b) of LGC 1991 defines the composition of the LDC as follows:

(1) All Punong Barangays (barangay captains) in the city or municipality;

(2) The chairman of the appropriations committee of the Sangguniang Panlungsod (city council) or Sangguniang bayan (municipal council);

(3) The local congressman or his representative; and

(4) Representatives of non-governmental organizations operating in the city or municipality, as the case may be, who shall constitute not less than one-fourth (1/4) of the total number of members of the fully organized council.

From the results, we found that 11.3% of LDCs (34 in total) did not include the local congressmen or their representative, 1.3% of LDCs (4 in total) did not include any representatives from an NGO/PO, and 0.7% of LDCs (2 in total) did not include the chairperson of the local council's appropriations committee. Therefore, we can say that these LDCs do not abide by the law. In addition, 5.7% of LDCs (17 in total) only have one representative from an NGO/PO. Considering that there must be a total of 5 members on the council including the mayor, these LDCs also do not meet the legal requirements.

Selecting representatives from NGOs/POs varies by LGU, as LGC 1991 does not have any specific provisions about the procedure. Because of this, the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) has expressed concern over the influence of mayors in the selection process (DILG 2001). Against this background, we asked C/MPDCs about who are involved in the selection process of NGO/PO representatives. Results showed that more than 90% of mayors (92.7%) were involved, while 95.0% of C/MPDCs, 90.3% of the officials from the local DILG office, and 91.3% of the members from the local council were involved at a high rate in the process. It is speculated that if the mayors are a part of the selection process, it will be easier to keep out NGOs/POs that they think should not participate in the council.

In addition, LGC 1991 establishes the executive committee of the LDC and stipulates that the mayor, the chairperson of the local council's appropriations committee, the

president of the league of barangays within the LGU, and one NGO/PO representative are to be assigned to the committee (Sec. 111). This means that each LGU is obligated to appoint at least one NGO/PO representative as a member of the executive committee. In the case of local governments who are actively promoting the participation of local people, they may try to appoint more NGO/PO representatives to the executive committee than the prescribed number. With this in mind, we asked whether the executive committee had more than the prescribed number of NGO/PO representatives and found that 42.7% of LDCs have appointed more NGO/PO representatives than the legally required number.

LGC 1991 also stipulates that the LDC general assembly shall be held twice a year. Therefore, we next asked how many times the general assembly is held each year. The results showed that 41.3% of LDCs held the assembly twice a year followed by 35.3% of LDCs who held the assembly more than three times a year. These results tell us that around 75% of LDCs hold the general assembly more often than stipulated by law. On the other hand, approximately 20% of LDCs hold the assembly less than once a year and as such, do not abide by the law.

We next asked whether LGUs obtain any project ideas from LDC members during the general assembly. Even if the general assembly is held, it cannot be said that the people are participating if it functions only as a place where new projects coming from mayors are introduced to the members. According to the results of the survey, we found that most of the LDCs, except 8 of them, made the general assembly function as a place for local governments to accept project proposals from committee members. Then, we asked what kinds of proposals were being made, and the most frequent answer was infrastructure development at 92.3%, followed by the environment at 88.0%, social welfare at 84.3%, and agricultural/fishery at 82.7%. For other sectors as well, 50% to 70% of local governments received proposals from the council members. Based on these results, we can conclude that members are actively proposing their project ideas at the general assembly.

On the other hand, we found that around 90% of mayors introduced their own projects at the general assembly. So, we asked about the specific policy areas of the mayors proposed projects and 83.7% of C/MPDCs responded that infrastructure development was the most frequently proposed project type. The second most frequently proposed type of project was the environment at 69.3%, followed by health at 68.7%, education at 64.3%, social welfare at 63.0%, and farming/fishery at 61.0%.

Based on the above results, LDC members actively propose their project ideas at the general assembly, while mayors also propose their own projects. We also conclude that

the LDC functions as a mechanism to encourage people's participation in the local development process, although we need to analyze the functions of the LDC in more detail.

Table III-1-1. Has the Local Development Council (LDC) formulated the comprehensive development plan (annual, medium, long term) and the public investment programs (annual and medium term)?

	Yes		No		No Answer	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
a. Annual Development Plan	291	97.0	9	3.0	0	0.0
b. Medium-term Development Plan	273	91.0	24	8.0	3	1.0
c. Long-term Development Plan	253	84.3	45	15.0	2	0.7
d. Annual Investment Program	287	95.7	7	2.3	6	2.0
e. Medium-term Investment Program	247	82.3	45	15.0	8	2.7

Table III-1-2. How many members does the LDC have?

1-2A. Mayor

Number of People	Frequency	Ratio
1	300	100.0

1-2B. Representative of Congressman

Number of People	Frequency	Ratio
0	34	11.3
1	243	81.0
2	11	3.7
3	2	0.7
4	2	0.7
6	2	0.7
9	1	0.3
21	1	0.3
49	1	0.3
No Answer	1	0.3
Don't Know	2	0.7

1-2C. Chairman of the appropriation committee of Municipal/City council

Number of People	Frequency	Ratio
0	2	0.7
1	270	90.0
2	16	5.3
3	3	1.0
4	2	0.7
7	1	0.3
10	2	0.7
11	1	0.3
14	1	0.3
16	1	0.3
Don't Know	1	0.3

1-2D. Barangay captains

Number of People	Frequency	Ratio
1-10	20	6.7
11-20	78	26.0
21-30	75	25.0
31-40	47	15.7
41-50	26	8.7
51-60	14	4.7
61-70	11	3.7
71-80	10	3.3
81-90	5	1.7
91-100	3	1.0
101-150	4	1.3
151-200	4	1.3
201 or more	2	0.7
Don't Know	1	0.3

1-2E. NGO / PO representatives

Number of People	Frequency	Ratio
0	4	1.3
1	17	5.7
2-5	103	34.3
6-10	81	27.0
11-20	59	19.7
21-30	14	4.7
31-40	5	1.7
41-50	6	2.0
51-60	3	1.0
100 以上	3	1.0
No Answer	3	1.0
Don't Know	2	0.7

Table III-1-3. Who attends the selection of the representatives from NGOs / POs?

	Attending		Not Attending		Not Applicable		No Answer	
	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio	Frequency	Ratio
1. Local Office of the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG)	271	90.3	25	8.3	0	0.0	5	1.7
2. Mayor	278	92.7	17	5.7	0	0.0	7	2.3
3. City / Municipal Administrator	177	59.0	103	34.3	1	0.3	19	6.3
4. Planning Officer	285	95.0	12	4.0	0	0.0	4	1.3
5. Other LGU Offices	239	79.7	52	17.3	0	0.0	17	5.7
6. Municipal/City councilors	274	91.3	22	7.3	0	0.0	10	3.3
7. Representatives for national government agencies（except for DILG）	16	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
8. Representatives of a congressman	3	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
9. Vice mayor	7	2.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

10. Provincial board members	1	0.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11. Barangay councilors	9	3.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
12. Business persons	13	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
13. Representatives from schools	3	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Note: Some answers are categorized multiply based on their contents.

Table III-1-4. Does the executive committee have extra-members from NGOs in addition to the members designated by law?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yes	128	42.7
2. No	171	57.0
3. Don't Know	1	0.3

Table III-1-5. Does the LDC hold a general assembly? IF YES: how many times in a year?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Once	59	19.7
2. Twice	124	41.3
3. Three or more	106	35.3
4. Not held	9	3.0
5. No Answer	1	0.3
6. Don't Know	1	0.3

Table III-1-6. Does the LGU obtain any ideas of projects from the members of LDC during the general assembly?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yes	292	97.3
2. No	8	2.7

Table III-1-7. IF YES, in which of the following sectors? (MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Agriculture / fishery	248	82.7
2. Health	232	77.3
3. Environment	264	88.0
4. Social welfare	253	84.3
5. Infrastructure development	277	92.3
6. Public market	189	63.0
7. Transportation	182	60.7
8. Housing	159	53.0
9. Education	230	76.7
10. Peace and Order	216	72.0
11. Livelihood projects	236	78.7
12. Tourism / Business	14	4.7
13. Public Administration	1	0.3
14. Others[*1]	4	1.3

Note: Some answers are categorized multiply based on their contents.

*1 No specific sector: 2（Project ideas from other local governments that we need: 1, Projects implemented by 20% of the community development fund: 1）, Loan for land owners: 1, Projects for the indigenous people: 1。

Table III-1-8. Did the mayor of the LGU propose his/her own projects during the general assembly of the LDC in the past year?

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Yes	274	91.3
2. No	25	8.3
3. Don't Know [*]	1	0.3

* One C/MPDC answered "don't know" because he/she "was assigned to the position just four days ago".

Table III-1-9. IF YES, in which of the following sectors? (MULTIPLE RESPONSE ALLOWED)

	Frequency	Ratio
1. Agriculture / fishery	183	61.0
2. Health	206	68.7
3. Environment	208	69.3
4. Social welfare	189	63.0
5. Infrastructure development	252[*1]	84.0
6. Public market	156	52.0
7. Transportation	132	44.0
8. Housing	149	49.7
9. Education	194	64.7
10. Peace and order	172	57.3
11. Livelihood projects	180	60.0
12. Tourism / Business	16	5.3
13. Public Administration	2	0.7

Note: Some answers are categorized multiply based on their contents.
*1 Including one (1) "cemetery."

4   Evaluation by Researchers

As indicated in section I, the response rate of our survey was 100%. In this section, we explain, based on Kobayashi et al. (2013), the factors and reasons why we secured a 100% response rate.

Our survey sample consisted of 300 cities and municipalities selected randomly from 1,515 local governments distributed throughout the country (excluding the ARMM). Initially, we tried to use a postal mail survey, thinking that it may be difficult to visit all sample LGUs. Because the Philippines comprises more than 7,000 islands, it takes a lot of time and resources, including personnel, to exhaustively access LGUs nationwide. We concluded, however, that the postal mail survey was not appropriate because the postal system in the Philippines has some problems such as non-arrival of mail. Moreover, mail surveys tend to have problems with low response rates, as Kobayashi et al. (2013) points out. Therefore, we decided to utilize a face-to-face interview survey. Our concern regarding the interview survey was that access to remote areas was difficult. In this regard, SWS used their network of field interviewers nationwide, which

has excellent access capability.

Nonetheless, we were concerned that there were some difficulties in interviewing local political elites such as the mayor of each LGU. Mayors may be quite busy because they have to deal with all of the issues in their local communities. In fact, it was not easy for the field interviewers to make appointments with the respondents and particularly with the mayors at one time. In some cases, interviews were rescheduled, and there was even an interview conducted at midnight.

Still, there were some factors for successfully obtaining a 100% response rate. The first point was that the reputation of SWS helped mayors to accept the interviews. SWS has considerable experience with different kinds of surveys, including political ones. The interviewers were almost all female and they were well trained. Besides this, we prepared three letters including a letter from the National President of the League of Municipalities. Therefore, the mayors were expected to be able to agree to the interview without great resistance.

A thorough pretest was the most important factor that contributed to realizing the high response rate. We conducted pretests in 20 LGUs at two different times. The first series of pretests were conducted in Manila and in adjacent provinces in January 2010. Then, we conducted pretests in the provinces of Aklan and Palawan in September of the same year. We selected 20 LGUs for pretests, taking geographical and socio-economic diversity into account.

After the pretest interviews, we revised the questionnaires several times to make them more relevant for the survey with political elites such as mayors and high-ranking officials of local governments. As a result, we reduced the volume of our questionnaires to around 20 minutes long, which was the maximum length of time the busy mayors and government officials could meet.

Finally, we introduced an incentive payment scheme. We entrusted the interviews to SWS and set up a baseline reward of 3 million pesos. "If [they] collect answers from more than 240 respondents (80%) of both mayors and officers, we were supposed to add 2,500 pesos for each government." (Kobayashi et al. 2013: 239). We believed interviewers would do their best to collect answers without such an incentive because we built up a mutual trust with them through repeated discussions. Still, according to SWS, this scheme was useful to enhance their motivation to collect as many answers as possible.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Benedict. 1988. "Cacique Democracy in the Philippines: Origins and Dreams." *New Left Review*, I/169, pp. 3-31.

Clarke, Gerard. 1998. *The Politics of NGOs in South-East Asia: Participation and Protest in the Philippines*. London; New York: Routledge.

Kobayashi, Jun, Kenichi Nishimura, Masao Kikuchi, and Maynard Matammu. 2013. "Efforts for 100% Response Rate: Local Government Survey in the Philippines as a Case." *Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities Seikei University* (48), pp. 233-240.

Putnam, Robert D. 1994. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sidel, John T. 1999. *Capital, Coercion, and Crime: Bossism in the Philippines*. Bloomington: Stanford University Press.

NOTES

This report is made based on the article titled "Philippine Local Government Elite Survey (1)," *Journal of law and politics of Osaka City University* 61 (3), 2014.

[1] For details of the survey, see Kobayashi et al. (2013).

[2] Since the cities and municipalities in the National Capital Region, Highly Urbanized Cities, and Independent Component Cities are out of the jurisdiction of any province, we took 280 samples, excluding the 20 samples that were not applicable, as the total number.

[3] Same as Note 2.

[4] There are cases that a career civil servant is appointed, but there are also cases that some are appointed from outside by the president or the secretaries of the relevant departments of the national government.

[5] The adjunct organization of DILG, which provides training on administrative management and administrative practices to public officials, including the chief executives of LGUs.