



Assessing the Local Good Governance Index of Barangay Abucayan, Goa, Camarines Sur: A Descriptive-Survey

Sheila E. Amoroso¹, Jemil R. Abay², Marita S. Magat, Ph.D³
Partido State University – College of Education

Abstract – The study generally aims to assess the state of good governance of one of the barangays in Goa, Camarines Sur, Philippines, using modified Governance for Local Development (GOFORDEV) Indexing. It follows a Descriptive-Survey Research Design utilizing FGD, KII and survey questionnaire as data gathering methodologies and instrument. To analyze the data, frequency count, percentage, and weighted mean were used. It was found out that despite the limited number of barangay ordinances catering to identified areas, the barangay's Good Governance Index (GGI) is 88.8 (Very Satisfactory). However, it was identified that with limited barangay ordinances, not all reported cases were solved and penalized. Majority of the residents believed that the inefficiency was caused by miscommunication between barangay officials due to political differences. Other identified contributory factors include: improper information dissemination and inadequate communication with residents. Despite these problems, majority of the residents are still highly and moderately satisfied of their local leaders' leadership. Some of the priority needs on governance include: training on local governance, team building workshops (recollections and retreats), and office management seminars. As such, it was recommended that extension planners conduct SWOT analysis and other activities in the barangay to address neglected areas on governance and education.

Keywords: Abucayan, assessment, Goa, good governance index, local governance

INTRODUCTION

In order for a country to prosper as a nation, it requires that its leaders observe and practice good governance in the performance of their duties as public officials. Good governance is defined by UNESCAP (n.d.) as the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented (or not implemented). It is a common knowledge that many of the problems or struggles being faced by the constituents can be traced back to the “decisions” or “indecisions” of its public officials.

Looking into the barangay level, good governance is also being expected by the government and of the people. As stipulated in the Local Government Code of 1991, “the chief executive of the Barangay is given with executive power for efficient, effective and economical governance, the purpose of which is the general welfare of the barangay and its inhabitants. Along this line, the Sangguniang Barangay members shall enact ordinances as may be necessary to discharge the responsibilities conferred upon it by law or ordinance and to promote the general welfare of the inhabitants therein.”

As such, all the elected officials are expected to perform their functions accordingly, most especially considering the interests of all residents through good governance.

In order to address the issues and concerns in the community, resolutions and ordinances are being crafted by the barangay officials. As indicated in section 384 of the Local Government Code of 1991, “the barangay serves as the primary planning and implementing unit of government policies, plans, programs, projects and activities in the community.” Its roles in nation-building really matter.

Given this demanding role, it is only proper and correct to check on their capacity readiness in delivering expected outcomes in the barangay level. Some studies were conducted in the past that focused on this. One notable study was that of Caldo (2015) who tried to link good governance to the competency of the barangay officials. He assessed the competency measures of the barangay council officials, and the findings show that the Punong Barangay and Sangguniang barangay members have strong belief that they are competent in performing their duties and functions; but this contradicts to the response of the



selected residents who said that they are uncertain to the performance of their barangay officials.

Many of these studies are perceptive in nature, thereby providing the researcher inadequate and lesser authentic information. To quantify good governance, Manasan, et. al (1999) and Capuno (n.d.) proposed some indicators that can be used to measure the innovativeness of local governments or their efficiency along certain areas such as planning, management and administration, resource generation and utilization, and environmental concerns.

Despite having this model and the availability of the desired data, it can be observed that most of the government units in the Philippines do not have formal surveys dealing with good governance which causes less responsive and less adequate measures in improving the governance conditions especially in the local level.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aims to survey the status of governance in Barangay Abucayan, Goa, Camarines along its good governance indexes for systems operations evaluation and policy formulation. Specifically, this study aims to:

1. Identify the barangay ordinances being implemented in the barangay along:
 - a. Education;
 - b. Health/Sanitation;
 - c. Environment;
 - d. Safety/Discipline; and
 - e. Governance.
2. Determine the present status of implementation of the ordinance/s along:
 - a. Number of related cases reported;
 - b. Number of cases solved; and
 - c. Number of cases penalized.
3. What are the factors affecting the efficient implementation of the ordinances as to:
 - a. residents' perception;
 - b. barangay officials' perception?
4. What is the level of efficiency on the leadership style of the barangay officials in implementing the ordinances based on the residents' perspective?
5. What other priority needs/problems/inadequacies in the barangay are present but not yet addressed as to the perception of the:
 - a. residents; and
 - b. barangay officials?

6. What are the level of indexes on good governance in barangay Abucayan along:

- a. Development Needs Index (DNI) indicated by the Adequacy of Health Services Ratio, Adequacy of Day Care Services Ratio, Access to Services of Drinking Water Ratio, Effectiveness in Addressing Public Problem Ratio, Effect on Family Condition Ratio;
- b. Development Orientation Index (DOI) as indicated by the Development Expenditure Ratio;
- c. Participatory Development Index (PDI) as indicated by the Participation in Municipal or City Development Council, Participation in Local School Boards, Barangay-Level Consultation Ratio, Presence in Barangay Meetings Ratio;
- d. Good Governance Index (GGI)?

MATERIALS & METHODS

Some of the data utilized in the present study were from previous studies on good governance. One of these is the study conducted by the Philippine Statistics Office (2005 & 2008) on the Governance Index of all the LGUs in the entire Philippines using the following governance indicators: 1) Economic Governance data which include total financial resources generated, total revenue collections (tax and non-tax revenue), total deposits, expenditure on social services, unemployment rate, underemployment rate, poverty incidence, poverty gap, and inflation rate); 2) Political Governance which include the crime solution efficiency rate and voters' turn-out rate; 3) Administrative Governance data, which include the elementary teacher to pupil ratio, high school teacher to student ratio, number of public elementary schools per 1000 school-age population, number of public high schools per 1000 school-age population, enrolment in government elem. school, enrolment in government high school, elementary cohort survival rate, high school cohort survival rate, elem. pupil-classroom ratio, high school student-classroom ratio, total health personnel per 1000 population Department of Health (DOH), % birth less than 2500g, length of national and local roads, percent of energized barangays, & telephone density.

The Good Governance Index (GGI) for each province is computed as the weighted arithmetic average using the formula:

$$GGI=(3*AGI+PGI+3*EGI)/7$$



Since the PGI has only two available indicators, more weights were given to the EGI and AGI. Whereas:

EGI = Economic Governance Index

PGI = Political Governance Index

AGI = Administrative Governance Index

GGI = Good Governance Index

Before computing for the GGI, the following data were computed first using the following formula:

$$EGI = (SMRI + EGRPI)/2$$

$$PGI = (IIESI + LEAJI + EGCI)/3$$

$$AGI = (EI + HI + ((PI + TDI)/2))/3$$

After getting the values for EGI, PGI and AGI, the GGI for all the provinces in the Philippines were computed and ranked by the National Statistical Coordination Board. Getting the result from the said computation, the data for municipality of Goa was generated.

Source of Data

The source of data in the local community are the barangay officials and residents in Barangay Abucayan.

Abucayan is one of the 34 barangays in the municipality of Goa, Camarines Sur, headed by the Punong Barangay with the seven Sangguniang Barangay Members, Sangguniang Kabataan Chairpeson, Barangay Secretary and Barangay Treasurer.

Research Design

This study made use of the Descriptive-Survey Research Design. To get the key information, Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Key Informant Interview (KII) were conducted. These data were used to develop the survey questionnaires and prepared the interview questions namely; the barangay ordinances present, the status of implementation, the factors affecting the success of implementing the barangay ordinances, and other information dissemination mechanisms done by the barangay officials to the residents. Furthermore, the study of Capuno (2003) also contributed in crafting the questions in determining the barangay good governance index.

Sampling Technique

For the FGD and KII, Purposive sampling was used using the following criteria: a) residents: a the head of the family/household and a bona fide resident of the barangay under study for 10 years or more , b)

barangay officials: an elected barangay official who authored a passing or has firsthand knowledge of the existence of the barangay ordinances, c) secretary: a designated barangay secretary who is aware of the barangay ordinances approved for the last 10 years or more, d) other stakeholders: teachers who are assigned in the school located in the barangay under study.

Data Gathering Procedure

These were further supported by reviewing some secondary data and collating responses from the KRA. PRA approach was utilized to attain the second and third objectives, specifically FGD and KII were the tools used to determine the issues and problems in barangay governance. The FGD was participated by the barangay officials, representative of the residents, and other key stakeholders.

The last objective was achieved using Capuno's (2003) indicators of good governance. Indicators and formula in the said study were used in this study. However, deviations from Capuno's study were applied especially in the interpretation of the computed GGI.

Ethical Considerations

Necessary ethical reviews were considered before, during and after the conduct of this study. Before the conduct of the study, a free prior and informed consent (FPIC) was sought from the intended respondents during an FGD. During the conduct of the study, researchers respect the non-response of the informants in some of the questions. After the conduct of the study, the results of the study were disseminated to the barangay officials and residents during an extension project conducted in response to the needs identified.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As per the Good Governance Index of the municipality of Goa, this was presented in the following table:

Table 1. Good Governance Index and Rank (GGI) of the Municipality of Goa (2005 and 2008)

Year	GGI	Rank
2005	131.08	643
2008	227.81	203

The municipality of Goa covers the respondent-barangay of Abucayan. As presented by NSCB in 2005, Goa got a GGI of 131.08 and ranked



643rd nationwide. Meanwhile, in 2008, Goa got a GGI of 227.81 and ranked 203rd nationwide. Goa had a difference of 96.73 in GGI in 2005 and 2008 compared to other municipalities covering Partido area which may be inferred that Goa manifested noteworthy improvement in terms of the indicators of good governance within that three-year period.

In the study made by Capuno, et.al (2003) on “The Development Payoffs of Good Governance: Emerging Results of a Social Experiment in Two Philippine Provinces”, it presents some corroborative evidence based on the first year of the pilot test of the Governance for Local Development (GOFORDEV) index in twelve (12) cities and municipalities located in the provinces of Bulacan and Davao del Norte in the Philippines was also used as basis of the present study.

The GOFORDEV index is used in this study as a measure of good governance, by using a score based on household survey and local government fiscal data and other documents. This survey was designed to gauge the overall assessment of the constituency regarding the delivery of basic public services and the extent of their participation and consultation in local affairs. For Capuno et. al, the GOFORDEV Index is a tool for citizen’s feedback mechanisms adopted in other countries such as India, which adopted the famous Report Card Survey which led to improvements in public services delivery. It can also be considered as a process for a wider and more effective people’s participation and consultation, which is considered to be both a means and end of development.

The GOFORDEV index is designed for local adoption which is believed to help in building the technical capability of the local government units and civil society organizations who serve as partners in pilot testing the instrument. The public discussion of the index in the pilot areas resulted to opportunities for local officials’ accountability both in terms of governance and local budget planning resulting to a more participative and consultative leadership.

Using the three indexes in the GOFORDEV index of Capuno, et.al (2003), the following were considered: 1) Development Needs Index which consist of the following indicators: Adequacy of Health Services Ratio, Adequacy of Day Care Services Ratio, Access to Sources of Drinking Water Ratio, Effectiveness in Addressing Public Problem Ratio, Effect on Family Condition Ratio; 2) Development Orientation Index (DOI) which consist of

Development Expenditure Ratio as an indicator, and 3) Participatory Development Index (PDI) which consists of the following indicators: Participation in Municipal or City Development Council, Participation in Local School Boards, Barangay-Level Consultation Ratio, and Presence in Barangay Meetings Ratio.

As of 2015, the total population of Barangay Abucayan totaled 2,059. Applying three-staged random probability sampling, the sample respondents were randomly selected from the zones of the barangay classified according to getting the adequate representative sample from the population using 1) 60% as sampling percentage which means 5 zones out of the total number of 7 zones, next is 2) determining the total number of households from the chosen zones by using the sampling calculator, and 3) getting the actual number of samples through the actual number of retrieved questionnaires/responses which totaled to 77 respondents.

The data gathered were presented in a tabular form and were analyzed using the descriptive-analytical method. The data from the survey conducted were analyzed using frequency count, percentage technique, weighted mean and the Governance for Local Development (GOFORDEV) Index of Capuno, et.al (n.d.) and are correlated to the Good Governance Index by municipality made by the National Statistical Coordination Board under the Philippine Statistics Office (PSO).

The statistical tools used in the study were frequency count, percentage technique and weighted mean.

Table 2. Actual Ordinances in Barangay Abucayan

Areas	Barangay ordinance present	Frequency count
Education	-	-
Health/Sanitation	BO 2001-01 BO 2008-11	2
Environment	BO 2004-05	1
Safety/Discipline	BO 2004-04 BO 2001-02	2
Governance	-	-
TOTAL	-	5

As presented in the table above, there are a total of 5 approved barangay ordinances in Barangay Abucayan. Two of which were under the areas of health and sanitation, one for the protection of the

environment, and two were under safety and discipline. On the other hand, it was found out that there were no barangay ordinances existing under the areas of education and governance.

Table 3. Status of Implementation of Ordinances

Areas	Barangay ordinance present	No. of cases reported	No. of cases solved	No. of cases penalized
Health/Sanitation	BO 2001-01 (an pagmitir kan gripo, tangke, asin tubo na pampubliko)	5	5	2
	BO 2008-11 (pag-apon nin basura sa gilid kan tinampo, o sa harani sa tindahan)	2	-	-
Environment	BO 2004-05 (an paglaag nin basketbolan, asin magkawat sa gilid kan tinampo)	2	-	-
Safety/Discipline	BO 2004-04(bawal an mga buhi na hayop-irog, baka, damulag asin mga iba pa)	8	8	5
	BO 2001-02(an pagsurat sa pader asin an vandalism)	2	-	-
TOTAL		19	13	7

As presented in table 3, it determined the status of implementation according to the number of cases reported, number of cases solved, and number of cases penalized. Through visual inspection alone, the barangay ordinance with the highest number of cases is the Barangay Ordinance No. 2004-04 (Bawal an mga buhi na hayop-irog, baka, damulag asin mga iba pa). This is followed by BO 2001-01 (an pagmitir kan gripo, tangke, asin tubo na pampubliko). And the rest of the barangay ordinances received the same number of reported cases (2 each) and got a total number of 19 reported cases. However, out of 19 reported cases, only 12 of them were solved and only 7 violators were penalized.

When interviewed about the cause or reason, most of the residents perceived that the inefficiency was due to miscommunication and differences of opinion among barangay officials especially those coming from different political affiliations. Most of

the barangay officials also confirmed that they need to conduct proper information dissemination, good communication with residents, and needs assessment mechanisms to develop their skills in articulating sympathy and generosity of the officers towards their constituents.

Table 4. Level of leadership efficiency of the barangay officials (n = 77)

Level of efficiency	Frequency count	Percentage
Poor	10	12.99
Good	47	61.03
Excellent	20	25.97

As perceived by the 77 respondents, 47 or 61.03% rated the level of efficiency as Good, 20 (25.97%) rated as Excellent, and 10 (12.99%) of them rated Poor. However, the 47 respondents who rated the level of efficiency as Good commented that they need more dialogue/communication/information on the importance and benefits to them, of such ordinances. Furthermore, support services should also be provided such as acting on their felt-needs would mean high level of efficiency on leadership style.

As shown in the table above, it clearly shows that the residents are satisfied in a way to the efficiency & effectiveness on the implementation of the barangay ordinances with minimal dissatisfaction in some issues.

Table 5. Client Satisfaction on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Barangay Ordinances Implementation (n = 539)

Observance of Good Governance Practices	Frequency	Percentage
Observed	309	57.33
Seldom Observed	188	34.88
Not Observed	42	7.79

As per data shown in Table 5, the data revealed that although the residents clearly observed good governance practices in their barangay; however, they still clamor for more support services on felt needs thru officials' consistent dialogue and direct communication to the needy.

Table 6. Level of Satisfaction on the Efficiency and Effectiveness of Barangay Ordinances Implementation (n=385)

Level of satisfaction	Frequency	Percentage
Highly Satisfied	205	53.25
Moderately Satisfied	171	44.42
Unsatisfied	9	2.34

It can be inferred from the data shown above that majority of respondents are highly satisfied with 205 (53.25%) while some are moderately satisfied with 171 (44.42%), and a minimal number 9 or (2.34%) out 385 were totally unsatisfied and look for effective leadership.

Table 7. Needs Assessment of Barangay Officials (N=10)

Areas	Frequency			Mean	Interpretation
	High	Average	Low		
LEADERSHIP SERVICES					
Further training on local governance	10	-	-	5.00	High Priority
Team building workshops	10	-	-	5.00	High Priority
Religious activities such as recollection and retreats	2	8	-	3.77	Average Priority
Leadership Seminar	10	-	-	5.00	High Priority
PUBLIC SERVICES					
Allocation of funds	10	-	-	5.00	High Priority
Potable Water	10	-	-	5.00	High Priority
Street Lights in "Sitios" or Upland Areas	3	5	-	3.33	Priority
Road Construction and Maintenance	2	4	2	2.66	Priority
EDUCATIONAL SERVICES					
Space for School Expansion	6	2	-	4.00	Average Priority
Educational Government Support on Improvement of Facilities	8	-	-	5.00	High Priority
Establishment of Mini-Library	-	8	-	2.66	Average Priority
LIVELIHOOD SERVICES					
Permanent Livelihood	10	-	-	5.00	High Priority

Note: 4.20- 5.00- High Priority; 3.40- 4.19- Average Priority; 2.60- 3.39- Priority; 1.80-2.59- Low Priority; 1.00-1.79- Not Priority

The residents believe that in order for their barangay officials to function efficiently, the following general categories of concerns were raised: 1) leadership services, 2) public services, 3) educational services, and 4) livelihood services. Under these general categories, most of the residents identified the following needs as having high priority:

1) further training on local governance, 2) team building workshops, and 3) leadership seminars. Furthermore, they also suggested spiritual-related seminars such as recollections and retreats in order to renew their spiritual relationships with the Creator.

Under Public services category, majority answered that there is a need for more sources of potable water in the barangay since it is geographically located in an upland area. Access to drinking water has been a need of the barangay residents most especially those who are residing in uplands and sitios and thus far from main lands. Other identified needs were provision of streetlights in sitios and road construction and maintenance.

In terms of educational services, the residents identified this as having high priority - educational government support on improvement of facilities such as space for school expansion and establishment of school library. In terms of livelihood services, most of them identified having a permanent source of livelihood to be of high priority. When the barangay officials were asked about their encountered problems which hinder the timely and efficient delivery of public services to the constituents, most of them answered that one of the major problems they have been encountering is the inadequate allocation of funds.

Moreover, other major problems identified by the barangay officials include: increasing number of out-of-school youth, increasing number of teenage pregnancy and early marriage. In terms of maintaining a drug-free barangay, both the residents and barangay officials reported that not all drug addicts have surrendered therefore, the drug traders (users/pushers) in their barangay are still doing freely their illegal activities.

As to livelihood, the barangay officials reported that most of the residents are ill-prepared to perform skill-related (vocational) jobs due to inadequate lack of education. As to environmental protection, both the barangay officials and the residents acknowledge that their barangay lacks adequate watershed preservation programs.

Table 8. Index levels of Good governance in Barangay Abucayan

Areas	Indicators	Values	Verbal Interpretation
Development Needs Index (DNI)	Adequacy of Health Services Ratio	(77/77)*10 0= 100	Satisfactory
	Adequacy of Day Care Services Ratio	(77/77)*10 0= 100	
DNI=1/5[(EFCR)+(EAPPR)+(ADCS R)+(AHSR)+(ASD WR)]	Access to Services of Drinking Water Ratio	100 – ([45/77]*10 0)= 41.56	Satisfactory
	Effectiveness in addressing Public Problem Ratio	(12/19)*10 0= 63.16	
DNI=1/5(100+100 +41.56+63.16+97.40) DNI=80.424	Effect on Family Condition Ratio	(75/77)*10 0= 97.40	Satisfactory
	Development Expenditure Ratio	(7/8)*100= 87.5	
Development Orientation Index (DOI)			Very Satisfactory
DOI=DER DOI=87.5			
Participatory Development Index	Participation in Municipal or City Development Council	100	Satisfactory
	Participation in Local School Boards	100	
PDI=1/4(PCLB+P MDC+BLCR+AB MR) PDI = ¼(100+100+58.44 +90.90) PDI=1/4(349.34) PDI= 98.585	Barangay-Level Consultation Ratio	(45/77)*10 0= 58.44	Excellent
	Presence in Barangay Meetings Ratio	(70/77)*10 0= 90.90	
Good Governance Index (GGI)		88.84	Very Satisfactory
GGI=1/3 (DNI+DOI+PDI) GGI=1/3 (80.424+87.5+98.585) 85) GGI=1/3(266.509) GGI=88.84			

Note: 65 and below - Poor; 66-74; Fair; 75-83 – Satisfactory; 84-92- Very Satisfactory; 93-100 – Excellent

Using Capuno's simplified GOFORDEV index formula in determining the Level of Indexes on Good Governance, the following data were derived: Development Needs Index (80.424), Development Orientation Index (87.5), Participatory Development

Index (98.585), Good Governance Index (88.84). Based on these data, setting the highest possible GGI to 100, Barangay Abucayan clearly performed high in all the indicators under Participatory Development Index except for Barangay Level Consultation Ratio which requires the number of respondents (residents, barangay officials) consulted by the mayor or vice mayor in the municipality of Goa.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As per data gathered and presented, it can be concluded that the inadequate number of official barangay ordinances overall does not speak of the poor good governance in the said barangay. Just as revealed in the computation of GOFORDEV index, the Barangay Abucayan got an 88.84 GGI which means Very Satisfactory. This means that the inadequate number of barangay ordinances did not affect its GGI.

However, the inadequacy of approved and implemented barangay ordinances may be due to inadequacy of barangay officials' writing skills in ordinance writing which is a common problem for barangay secretaries in local government units since most of the officials and secretary-designate do not possess the proper training and educational background in carrying out their posts.

This is the reason why the national government through its Department of Interior and Local Government has been continuously conducting capacity development trainings and seminars for local leaders in order to address this problem.

Despite the presence of limited barangay ordinances, however, it does not translate to efficient and proper implementation. This may be attributed to the officials' overfamiliarity of offenders to local leaders such as the latter's being a relative (*kamag-anak*), law apellates (*kumare, kumpare, inaanak*) of the former, etc. The government officials tend to bend to the offenders due to socialization (*pakikisama*) and debt of gratitude (*utang-na-loob*). Socialization (*pakikisama*) happens when a local official thinks of his social relationship to the offender instead of his official duty since they are their relatives or close friends. Debt of gratitude or *utang-na-loob* happens when the offender/s were once their supporters during election. These two factors are said to be important considerations for their future political career.

Moreover, the constituents also observed socialization (*pakikisama*) by not putting down their local officials during the conduct of this study. When



asked whether their local officials practice good governance, most of them said they clearly observed good governance among their local officials, however, the local officials believed otherwise saying that they lack dedication and responsibility in implementing the ordinances.

Miscommunication is also a major factor identified in the unsuccessful implementation of the barangay ordinances and was attributed to the varying political affiliations of those concerned. Some tend to use the personal political bias in the implementation that results to miscommunication.

The establishment of Lupong Pamayapa is one of the key solutions of the national government in resolving local conflicts in the barangay. Their role in the barangay is so important since they should form part in maintaining the peace and order in the community. As such, they need to be tapped in resolving miscommunication issues that result to unproductive results. Furthermore, in order not to make the penalty decision as “political”, prior public information dissemination drives may be conducted.

Similarly, in order to address the issue raised by the constituents on the need for a consistent dialogues and constant communication with the needy, the local officials should regularly conduct barangay assemblies which provide the residents ample opportunities to air out their concerns to the public and concerned officials. Furthermore, participatory governance approach may also be applied in order to have a smooth organizational flow in the barangay by asking a representative for every sector to be present during special meetings and/or local sessions in decision-making.

As to the needs identified by the officials, collaborative efforts with local leaders (LGUs, HEIs, DILG, etc) may be put in place in order to address their concerns. This is a good opportunity for extension project collaborations on the part of the education sector, religious sector and local government units in order to provide them with trainings on local governance, team building workshops, recollections, retreats, office management seminar and proper budget allocation.

Acknowledgment

The researchers are greatly indebted to Barangay Abucayan, Goa, Camarines Sur, its barangay officials and residents for their participation in conducting this study and to Partido State University for allocating internal budget.

REFERENCES

- Capuno, J. et al (2003). ISTR International Conference in Cape Town, South Africa. Accessed at: http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_cape_town/capuno.pdf?hhSearchTerms=. Accessed on: October 3, 2017.
- Capuno, J. et. al (2003). The Development Payoffs of Good Governance: Emerging Results of a Social Experiment in Two Philippine Provinces. UP-NCPAG International Conference. Manila. Accessed at: http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.istr.org/resource/resmgr/working_papers_cape_town/capuno.pdf?hhSearchTerms= Accessed on October 22, 2017.
- Good Governance Index (n.d). Accessed at: <http://nap.psa.gov.ph/ggi/techNotes.asp#III>. Accessed on: October 3, 2017.
- Miranda, et.al.(2011). Chasing the Wind: Assessing Philippine Democracy. Commission on Human Rights, Philippines. Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines. Accessed at: <http://www.ombudsman.gov.ph/UNDP4/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/DEMOCRACY-with-INDEX-LAYOUT-JAN-04-2012.pdf>. Accessed on: October 3, 2017
- Municipal Good Governance Index for 2005 and 2008 by Region and Province. Accessed at: http://nap.psa.gov.ph/ggi/MunicipalGGI_2005_2008_NSCB.pdf. Accessed on: October 3, 2017.
- Research Assignments (n.d). Accessed at: <https://prudencexd.weebly.com/>. Accessed on: October 3,2017.
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission on Asia and the Pacific (n.d.). What is Good Governance?. Accessed at: <https://www.unescap.org/sites/default/files/good-governance.pdf>. Accessed on: October 17, 2020.