



CITIZENS' SATISFACTION ON ECONOMIC AND INVESTMENT PROMOTION SERVICES OF A COASTAL TOWN IN CAMARINES SUR, PHILIPPINES

Nora E. Bacares

Partido State University, Goa,
Camarines Sur,
Philippines

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra6762>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra6762

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the people's satisfaction on the Economic and Investment Promotion Services of a Local Government Unit (LGU) in Camarines Sur, Philippines utilizing the Citizen Satisfaction Index System (CSIS) initiated by the Department of the Interior of Local Government (DILG). Particularly, it determined the awareness, availment, and satisfaction of the citizens on Economic and Investment Promotion Services provided by the LGU. The study used a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods through face-to-face interviews with 150 actual residents randomly sampled from the barangays with male and female equal distribution of the target LGU. Samples were drawn from barangays where most people resided. Barangays with larger shares of the population had more spots and respondents in the sample. The latest 2015 census data on population and housing was the basis for allocating the spots among the barangays according to population share. The multi-stage probability sampling was employed to give all citizens, 18 years old and above, an equal chance to be selected as a participant (CSIS, 2019). The residents of this coastal, 4th class municipality had a low level of satisfaction but high in need for action on Economic and Investment Promotion. Their recommendations focused on the need for livelihood trainings on the production of local goods as well as conduct of promotional activities of these locally-produced goods. With 67.33% of the household-respondents who are beneficiaries of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps), another recommendation centered on giving attention to the conduct of promotional campaigns of the local tourist attractions because the citizens believe that tourism activities could help create local employment for them to improve their economic condition.

KEYWORDS: Citizen Satisfaction, Local Government Unit, Basic Services, Economic and Investment Promotion

INTRODUCTION

Local Government Units (LGUs) play a significant role in the development of their constituents. Basic services should be their main priority in order to implement these services to a high standard (Leal, R.C. et.al., 2020). As provided in Section 16 of the Local Government Code of 1991, all local government units are mandated to provide basic services that will answer to the needs of their citizens. Of these local basic services, the Economic and Investment Promotion Services is increasingly recognized as an indispensable driver of sustainable development with the potential to lift households and communities out of poverty.

In most rural communities like the target LGU in this study which is a 4th class coastal municipality, most of the citizens still depend on low productivity-subsistence farming as their livelihoods. According to Leur, A.V. (2017), there is more to rural economies than farming. Rural areas are characterized by a great diversity of economic activities, including processing and marketing of agricultural products, tourism, mining and services. Harnessing the potential of rural economy through decent work is key to sustainable development goals' pledge to leave no one behind (Leur, A.V.,2017).

The author firmly believes in Petrin, T. (1994) stressing that economic vitality of a country is no doubt a necessary condition for social vitality. Without it other important factors that make living attractive in

certain areas, such as education, health, social services, housing, transport facilities, flow of information and so on, cannot be developed and sustained in the area in the long run.

In fact, the Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG) issued a Memorandum Circular No. 2020-167 dated Dec.9,2020 "Guidelines on Promoting Local Economic Development and Investment Promotion and Establishment of LEDIP Office/Unit in all Provinces, Cities, and Municipalities." This is aimed at enhancing the capabilities of LGUs to improve local economy as they play an active role in attracting investments. In addition, the presence of Local Economic and Investment Promotion Office in all provinces, cities and municipalities is deemed necessary to encourage more investments and competitiveness in the locality to sustain economic development.

With these, local governments must be efficient, responsive and effective in delivering the basic services as their mandates. To note, the DILG has been utilizing performance measurement tools for LGUs as early as the 1980s. As local governance is a vast domain in terms of conceptual breadth, programs were focused on building the internal capacity of LGUs and on developing outcome indicators on a number of thematic performance areas (Citizen Satisfaction Index System, 2019).



As the intended recipients and end-users of public services, the citizens are deemed in a better position to determine whether or not these services are delivered according to their needs and to the extent that they fulfill their everyday and long-term human development requirements. Thus, getting their sentiments, opinions and insights based on their own perception and evaluation as consumers of local public services is a logical method of shaping what local governments need to do to ensure welfare of the citizens, without neglect of statutory requirements expected from them (CSIS, 2019).

Through DILG Memorandum Circular 2019-12, the Citizen Satisfaction Index System was implemented in municipalities targeted by the DILG Regional Office in order to equip them with tools and procedures for wider implementation in the following years. Local Resource Institutes are contracted by the Department as partners in gathering data and interpreting results for development and research purposes (CSIS, 2019).

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study assessed the people's satisfaction on the Economic and Investment Promotion Services of a Local Government Unit (LGU) in Camarines Sur, Philippines. Specifically, it aimed to: 1) describe the socio-demographic profile of the respondents; 2) determine the satisfaction level of the citizen – respondents on the Economic and Investment Promotion Services provided by the target LGU; 3) provide the target LGU basis for crafting well-informed policies and management decisions that focus on economic and investment promotion as areas for socio-economic development.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The Study Site. The study site is a coastal municipality in the province of Camarines Sur and is classified as 4th class. Based on data from 2015 Census of Population, it has a total population of 17,764 which denotes a positive growth rate of 0.78% or an increase of 714 people from the previous population of 17,050 in 2010 (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2016). The municipal center of this town is situated at approximately 14°1' North, 123° 16' East in the island of Luzon. It has a total land area of 141.27 square

kilometers or 54.54 square miles which constitutes 2.57% of Camarines Sur's total area.

Research Design

The study used a mix of quantitative and qualitative research methods through face-to-face interviews with actual residents randomly sampled from the barangays of the target LGU. The CSIS uses multi-stage probability sampling in order to ensure that every citizen, 18 years old and above, male or female, who have lived at least six months in the municipality, is given an equal chance to be selected as a participant in the study with no preference for any particular socio-demographic characteristic, political/ideological orientation or religious belief (CSIS, 2019). The survey measured the citizens' awareness, availment, and level of satisfaction of the Economic and Investment Promotion Services provided by the local government unit. The key results of the survey are the main information gathered from the citizens to assess how well public services by their LGUs are received or perceived in their point of view. Citizens' perception domain are the core concept; reasons that substantiate the core concepts; general attitudes of citizens toward the LGU; overall satisfaction, overall need for action; and recommendations for improvement.

Sampling Procedures

The research utilized multi-stage probability sampling in selecting the 150 respondents, as set by CSIS framework. This sample had a margin of error of +/-8% at 95% confidence level. Multi-stage random probability sampling warranted that a cross-section of citizens in an LGU was included in the sample. Since the CSIS was interested in the general population, the sample was likely drawn from barangays where most people resided. Barangays with larger shares of the population had more spots and respondents in the sample. The latest 2015 census data on population and housing was the basis for allocating the spots among the barangays according to population share. The total number of spots was 30, as required by CSIS framework, distributed among the barangays except the 4 barangays with very small population of less than 500.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Socio-Demographic Profile

Table 1

Distribution of Respondents According to Socio-Demographic Profile

Relationship to Household Head	Frequency	Percentage Score
1 - Household head	62	41.33
2 - Spouse/ Partner	59	39.33
3 - Son/ Daughter	10	6.67
4 - Brother/ Sister	3	2.00
5 - Son-in-Law/ Daughter-in-Law	3	2.00
6 - Grandson/grand daughter	1	0.67
7 - Father/ Mother	10	6.67
8 - Other relative	2	1.33
Total	150	100.00
Civil Status	Frequency	Percentage Score
1 - Single	14	9.33
2 - Married	93	62.00



3 - Widow/er	7	4.67
4 - Separated/ Annulled	4	2.67
5 - Common Law/ Live in	32	21.33
Total	150	100.00
Age Group	Frequency	Percentage Score
1 - 18→24	15	10.00
2 - 25→29	16	10.67
3 - 30→34	15	10.00
4 - 35→39	18	12.00
5 - 40→44	16	10.67
6 - 45→54	28	18.67
7 - 55→64	30	20.00
8 - 65→74	7	4.67
9 - 75 and above	5	3.33
Total	150	100.00
Educational Attainment	Frequency	
1.- Elementary Undergraduate	14	9.33
2 - Elementary Graduate	35	23.33
3 - High School Undergraduate	30	20.00
4 - High School Graduate	48	32.00
5 - College Undergraduate	9	6.00
6 - College Graduate	9	6.00
7- Vocational/TVET	5	3.33
Total	150	100.00
Employment Status	Frequency	
Working at least 40 hrs/wk	29	19.33
Working less than 40 hrs/wk	53	35.33
Not employed but looking for work; have worked in the past	6	4.00
Not employed but looking for work; have not worked in the past	5	3.33
No job, not looking for work; have not worked in the past	17	11.33
Not employed, not looking for work; have worked in the past	16	10.67
Student (not working)	11	7.33
Retired (not working) / Too old to work	13	8.67
Total	150	100.00
Occupational Category		
Officials of Government, corporate managers	7	8.54
Managing Proprietors and Supervisors	1	1.22
Professionals	5	6.10
Service, Shops, Market Workers	1	1.22
Farmer/Forestry, Fisherman	38	46.34
Traders and related workers	2	2.44
Laborers/Unskilled workers	15	18.29
No Response / Unknown / Cannot Remember	5	6.10
Others (Specify)	8	9.76
Total	82	100.00

Table 1 shows that among a total of 150 citizen-respondents, 62 were household head or 41.33%. More than half (62.00%) were married, 20.00% were within the age range of 55-64 years old, and 32.00% or 48 of them graduated in high school. Probably because of their age or big responsibility as household head, 90.00% of the respondents do not attend school anymore. Fifty-three or 35.33% of the respondents were employed and working for at least 40 hours per week; clustered in the occupation category of farmer/forestry, fisherman (46.34%), and laborers/unskilled workers (18.29%). Of these, only 7 or (8.54%) were government officials or corporate managers. Since most of them were working as farmers

and fishermen, 67 or 81.71% of the respondents are working within their barangays and 15 or 18.29% were within their municipality.

It is highly noted that (67.33%) or 101 of the households were beneficiaries of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4 P's). Based from the report of "The Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines," beneficiaries of the 4Ps are selected through the National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction (NHTS-PR), which identifies who and where the poor are in the country. In addition, to become eligible for the program, they must be residents of the poorest municipalities, based on 2003 Small Area Estimates (SAE) of the National Statistical



Coordination Board (NSCB). These households are those whose economic condition is equal to or below the provincial poverty threshold (<https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/>). Having this significant number of household beneficiaries of 4Ps, poverty is very evident. According to the report of the International Labour Office (2007), generation of jobs is a main concern of local communities. As a matter of fact, many of the policy initiatives of LGUs ultimately aim for sustainable employment and livelihood. These statements would make sense in the need to evaluate the delivery of services by the LGU specifically on the economic and investment promotions which main concern is to alleviate poverty if not to eradicate totally.

2. Service indicators under economic and investment promotion service

There were 16 indicators investigated under Economic and Investment Promotion. Based from the LGU Service Delivery Baseline Data, it did not provide

services on Organization, Accreditation and Training of Tourism-related Concessions, Organization and Development of Farmers, Fishermen and their Cooperatives, Access to Facilities that Promote Agricultural Products, Post-harvest Facilities and Accessible Farm Harvest Buying/trading Stations. This non-provision of essential services is not surprising that according to "The Philippines – Canada Local Government Support Program: A Case Study of Local Government Capacity Development in the Philippines,"(2006), when the local government code was implemented in 1991, many local governments lacked the capacity to carry out their enhanced mandate. This is despite of the fact that the outstanding features of this code are: (1) it grants local government units significant regulatory powers, including land classification and community-based forestry and fisheries; (2) it devolves to local government units the responsibility for the delivery of basic services (e.g. agriculture extension, public works, health, housing, social welfare, tourism and investment promotion).

Table 2
Service indicators for employment, livelihood and business promotion
2.1 Employment, Livelihood and Business Promotion

Service Indicators on Economic & Investment Promotion	Awareness		Availment		Satisfaction			Needs Action		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Adjectival Rating	Yes	No	Adjectival Rating
Public Employment Services	29 19.33 %	121 80.67 %	6 20.69 %	23 79.31 %	6 (100%)	0 (0%)	Small Sample	2 33.33%	4 66.67 %	Small Sample
Regulation and Supervision of businesses	36 24.00 %	114 76.00 %	16 44.44 %	20 55.56 %	15 93.75%	1 (6.25 %)	High	8 50.00%	8 50.00	Low
Promotion of Barangay Micro-Business Enterprises	30 20.00 %	120 80.00 %	7 23.33 %	23 76.66 %	7 100.00%	0 0%	Small Sample	3 42.86%	4 57.14 %	Small Sample
Livelihood program	48 32.00 %	102 68.00 %	9 18.75 %	39 81.25 %	9 100.00%	0 0%	Small Sample	2 22.22%	7 77.78 %	Small Sample

Among the indicators under Employment, Livelihood and Business Promotion, Public Employment Services had a very glaring low awareness with only 29 or 19.33% out of 150 respondents were aware of it. With this low awareness level, availment was similarly low with only 20.69% of those aware have availed of this service. Those who did not avail declared that there are no existing programs on this service area.

Specifically, under Regulation and Supervision of Businesses, awareness was low getting only 24.00% of the citizens surveyed. The same low rating was noted along availment which only 44.44% of the citizens who are aware have availed. Those who did not avail was for the reason that they do not have business of their own and that they do not have idea about regulations on running business. Worth noting is the high satisfaction rating of 93.75% among those who availed of this service because they were granted with business permits. Further, 50.00% of those who expressed they are satisfied declared that there is no need for action, hence; low in need for action.

In terms of service on Promotion of Barangay Micro Business Enterprises, less citizens are aware of it having only 30 or 20.00% of 150 respondents disclosed that they are aware. From these 30 citizens aware, only

7 or 23.33% claimed that they have availed which resulted to low availment rating. Those who did not avail cited that there is actually no program on this service area in their barangay. It is good to cite that 100.00% of these respondents who availed declared their satisfaction although noted as Small Sample. The same Small Sample was noted under need for action with 42.86%.

Establishing a business requires compliance with a strict legal regime; local governments should make an effort to systematize the processing of requirements. For instance, the Business Permit and Licensing Division-Business One Stop Shop (BPLD-BOSS) aims to streamline the process of obtaining a business permit with systematic implementation (Leal, Rosalie C. et.al., 2020). When all these are in place, customers must be aware of the applicable legal obligations; they must be aware that businesses are subject to inspection, but customers expect suitable and prompt activities by regulators or government. With these, government then needs to guide and inform customers how they will carry out their obligation in the process of providing the service (Leal, R.C. et.al., 2020).



Another indicator that got low awareness rating was Livelihood Programs with 32.00%. This low percentage of awareness got a much lower percentage in availment at 18.75%. Such low availment could be attributed to the reason cited by those who did not avail that only very few citizens at most only the 4P's beneficiaries can avail of the livelihood program. Other respondents declared the absence of this particular service in their barangay. On the other, 100.00% satisfaction was conveyed by 9 respondents but noted as Small Sample. In the same way, as to the need for action, a small sample was recorded.

The Philippine Department of Social Welfare and Development has led in the provision of

opportunities for income-generating activities and livelihood development through the implementation of the Sustainable Livelihood Program since 2011. The objective of which is to reduce poverty and inequality by generating employment among poor households and by moving highly vulnerable households into sustainable livelihoods and towards economic stability (retrieved from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/philippines/publication>). This suggests that the local government may tap other agencies and NGOs for providing livelihood programs to its citizens.

Table 3
Service indicators for tourism promotion
2.2 Tourism Promotion

Service Indicators on Economic & Investment Promotion	Awareness		Availment		Satisfaction			Needs Action		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Adjectival Rating	Yes	No	Adjectival Rating
Development and maintenance of tourist attractions and facilities	42 28.00	108 72.00 %	19 45.24 %	23 54.76 %	18 94.74%	1 5.26%	High	3 15.79%	16 84.21 %	Low
Product/brand Marketing & Promotion of Local Goods and Tourist Attractions	17 11.33 %	133 88.67 %	2 11.76 %	15 88.24 %	2 100.00 %	0 0%	Small Sample	0 0.00%	2 100.00 %	Small Sample
Investment promotion activities such as trade fairs, fiestas, business events and similar events	52 34.67 %	98 65.33 %	46 88.46 %	6 11.54 %	41 89.13%	5 10.87 %	High	11 23.91%	35 76.09 %	Low

Along Product/brand Marketing and Promotion of Local Goods and Tourist Attractions, only 17 out of 150 respondents or 11.33% are aware of this service, hence; rating is low on awareness. In same manner, availment was lowest with 11.76% on a 73.77% cut-off. Citizens surveyed cited that they do not have locally – made products for display or promotion because there is actually no existing program on this particular area.

Under Investment Promotion Activities such as Trade Fairs, Fiestas, Business and Similar Events, awareness was also low with only 52 out of 150 households or 34.67% revealed they are aware. On the contrary, availment was high having 46 out of 52 who are aware have availed resulting to 88.46% high availment rating. Those citizens who did not avail

confided that promotion activities on investment are seldom conducted and if there was an activity on this, it was only during the town fiesta that it is conducted (66.67%). Moreover, this high availment rating was equally rated high in satisfaction on 89.13%. This could be attributed to the statements of those who availed that trade fairs and other similar activities happened only during the town fiesta. However, those who expressed they are not satisfied was actually for same reason that it was only during fiesta that these activities happened which could mean that citizens felt the need of this investment promotion activities on a regular basis and not only during fiesta celebration that happened only once in a year. Similarly, a low need for action resulted from 35 out of 46 or 64.45% who stated that there is no need for action along this specific service area.

Table 4. Service indicators for agricultural support
2.3 Agricultural Support

Service Indicators on Economic & Investment Promotion	Awareness		Availment		Satisfaction			Needs Action		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Adjectival Rating	Yes	No	Adjectival Rating
Access to irrigation facilities or equipment	15 10.00 %	135 90.00%	2 13.33%	13 86.67%	1 50.00%	1 50.00 %	Small Sample	1 50.00%	1 50.00 %	Small Sample
Prevention and control of plant and animal pests and diseases; fish kills and diseases	42 28.00 %	108 72.00%	18 42.86%	24 57.14%	18 100.00 %	0 0%	High	10 55.56%	8 44.44 %	Low
Distribution of planting/farming/fishing materials and/or equipment	70 46.67 %	80 53.33%	28 40.00%	42 60.00%	25 89.29%	3 10.71 %	High	8 28.57%	20 71.43 %	Low
Water and soil resource utilization and conservation projects	22 14.67 %	128 85.33%	7 31.82%	15 68.18%	7 100.00 %	0 0%	Small Sample	1 14.29 %	6 85.71 %	Small Sample
Enforcement of fishery laws in municipal waters	56 37.33 %	94 62.67%	39 69.64%	17 30.36%	35 89.74%	4 10.26 %	High	21 53.85%	18 46.15 %	Low



Under this service area, the specific service indicator on Access to Irrigation Facilities or Equipment also got low awareness rating of only 10.00% of the total respondents declaring that they are aware. The same low rating on availment (13.33%) or 86.67% of those who are aware did not avail because as the surveyed citizens cited, there are no irrigation facilities that the municipality offered. In addition, a Small Sample was noted under satisfaction rating and Need for Action.

Serious attention should also be given to the service on Water and Soil Resource Utilization and Conservation Projects. This must also be noted that awareness was low with 22 out of 150 or 14.67% of the respondents disclosed that they are aware of this service. Moreover, availment was also low getting only 31.82% of those aware have availed. The citizens who did not avail cited that there is actually water scarcity in their area. Considerably, a Small Sample was recorded for both Satisfaction and Need for action with only 7 respondents.

In terms of availment, still the service on Product/brand Marketing and Promotion of Local

Goods and Tourist Attractions was the lowest on 11.76% availment rating. This target coastal municipality has a big potential for tourism industry. Javier and Elazigue (2011) state that tourism as a product and service-oriented industry, could generate widespread benefits and impacts to the economy and society. In view of the socio-economic benefits that could accrue to communities, it is imperative that communities capitalize on opportunities from tourism. One of the major authorities which provide the key roles to this success is that of local government units (LGUs). LGUs could provide the ideal, authority, infrastructure, policy and planning procedures to maximize the benefit for its communities. LGUs play a major role in a community's development, provide the links between the people and government, address its community's problems and concerns, enforce policies and hold influence over its communities. The LGUs are also intermediaries in channelling the framework of government into each individual community in order to create a beneficial outcome.

High Satisfaction			
Low Need for Action	2 Exceeded Expectations	1 Continued Emphasis	High Need for Action
	3 Secondary Priority	4 Opportunities for Improvement	
Low Satisfaction			

Figure1. Action Grid

Source: CSIS Manual, 2017

Under the dimensions of Satisfaction and Need for Action, this study made use of an Action Grid which is a tool to prioritize the different services. The indicators are regrouped into four quadrants to provide general recommendations to the LGU and other audiences (CSIS Manual, 2019).

On the overall, Economic and Investment Promotion was low in satisfaction (56.35%) but high in need for action (90.48%). Service areas falling under Opportunities for Improvement are those targeted as critical areas for improvement because they were relatively low in satisfaction but were deemed to highly require local government action. Moreover, these services are deemed to be critical points for serious quality improvements. The negative aspects of delivery of these services can be presumed as drivers for dissatisfaction; but if addressed, they can be potential drivers for satisfaction. Therefore, these services should be given the highest priority and attention. This may also suggest or reflect local issues in the communities that demand attention of local authorities (CSIS Manual, 2019).

The local government unit as mandated service provider should begin to think about how to deliver better services and how to mobilise the resources to do so. Similarly, this target LGU needs to join forces with other LGUs and levels of government, community groups and the private sector, and to look

for examples of innovation and best practices to help address its service delivery challenges (Yule, A. 2006).

It must be highly noted that all the indicators under Economic and Investment Promotion were rated low in awareness although the lowest were on Access to Irrigation Facilities or Equipment (10.00%) and Product/brand Marketing and Promotion of Local Goods and Tourist Attractions (11.33%). In terms of availment, still the service on Product/brand Marketing and Promotion of Local Goods and Tourist Attractions was the lowest on 11.76% availment rating. On the other hand, along satisfaction, although 6 indicators were noted as Small Sample, all the others were rated high which highest was on Prevention and Control of Plant and Animal Pests and Diseases (100.00%). As to the need for action, aside from those noted as Small Sample, other indicators were rated low.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the summarized results of the survey, the following conclusions were drawn. Most of the respondents were working as farmers and fishermen. Moreover, many of the households were beneficiaries of the Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program (4Ps) whose economic condition is equal to or below the provincial poverty threshold.

All the indicators under Economic and Investment Promotion were rated low in awareness



although the lowest were on Access to Irrigation Facilities or Equipment (10.00%) and Product/brand Marketing and Promotion of Local Goods and Tourist Attractions (11.33%). In terms of availment, still the service on Product/brand Marketing and Promotion of Local Goods and Tourist Attractions was the lowest on 11.76% availment rating. On the other hand, along satisfaction, although 6 indicators were noted as Small Sample, all the others were rated high which highest was on Prevention and Control of Plant and Animal Pests and Diseases (100.00%). As to the need for action, aside from those noted as Small Sample, other indicators were rated low.

On the overall, services under Economic and Investment Promotion was rated low in satisfaction but high in need for action. This particular service belongs to quadrant 4 indicating opportunities for improvement. This must be given attention since this is targeted as critical area for improvement. This could also mean that services under this area should be given the highest priority and attention specifically on activities and programs that would serve as a source of livelihood and income for the citizens.

Hence, citizen-respondents recommended the following:

1. In line with economic and investment promotion, the LGU and other concerned agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources should intensify promotion and information dissemination about livelihood projects to reach out residents living in far-flung areas.
2. Citizens suggested that promotional activities on local tourist attractions in this municipality be intensified because they believe that this would help create local employment for them.

REFERENCES

1. Bueno, C. (2015). *Citizen satisfaction evaluation of the local government unit in the Philippines: A case study of good governance advocacy of the city government of candon*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265710911_Citizen_Satisfaction_Index_System_CSIS-Candon_City
2. *Citizen Satisfaction Index System - Local Government Relations*. Retrieved March 23, 2021, from
<https://sites.google.com/site/localgovrelations/csis?overridemobile=true>
3. *Guidelines on Promoting Local Economic Development and ... - DILG*. Retrieved March 23, 2021, from
<https://dilg.gov.ph/issuances/mc/Guidelines-on-Promoting-Local-Economic-Development-and-Investment-Promotion-and-Establishment-of-LEDIP-Office-Unit-in-all-Provinces-Cities-and-Municipalities/3317>
4. Javier, A. & Elazigue, D. (2011). *Opportunities and challenges in tourism development role of local government units in the Philippines*.
https://www.academia.edu/9545190/Opportunities_and_Challenges_in_Tourism_Development_Roles_of_Local_Government_Units_in_the_Philippin.
5. Leal, R., Sagubo, O. & Brutus, R. (2020). *Local government unit basic services: implementation and assessment*. *GATR Global of Business and Social Science Review* 8 (1) 49-59 (2020)
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3551098. Accessed 25 Mar. 2021.

6. Legaspi, P. (2016). *Citizen satisfaction in Ibus: The case of Dagupan. The 4th International Conference on Magsaysay Awardees: Good Governance and Transformative Leadership in Asia, 31 May 2016*.
7. <http://www.copag.msu.ac.th/conference4/files/PDF/10.5%20Perla%20E.%20Legaspi%20160-168.pdf>
8. *Official Gazette of the Republic of the Philippines*. (n.d.). | *The Official* Retrieved March 23, 2021, from <https://www.officialgazette.gov.ph/>
9. *POPCEN 2015 | Philippine Statistics Authority*. (n.d.). <https://psa.gov.ph/tags/popcen-2015>
10. *Protecting people, promoting jobs - ILO*. Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---dcomm/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_113996.pdf
11. *R.A. 7160 an act providing for a local government code of 1991*. Retrieved March 23, 2021, from https://www.lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1991/ra_7160_1991.html
12. Villanueva, G., Villantes, Y., Sultan, G., Calago, J., & Cambangay, A. (2019). *Citizens' judgement on local government performance in delivering agricultural services in three cities of misamis occidental, Philippines*. *International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education (IJHSSE)*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348445536_Citizens'_Judgment_on_Local_Government_Performance_in_Delivering_Agricultural_Services_in_Three_Cities_of_Misamis_Occidental_Philippines. Accessed 25 Mar. 2021
13. (2021, January 27). *Philippines - World Bank Group*. Retrieved March 23, 2021, from <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/philippines/coronavirus>