

Title	What Factors Promote Participation in Local Governance : The Philippines as a Case
Author(s)	Nishimura, Kenichi
Citation	多文化社会と留学生交流 : 大阪大学国際教育交流センター研究論集. 2024, 28, p. 11-21
Version Type	VoR
URL	<a href="https://doi.org/10.18910/94686">https://doi.org/10.18910/94686</a>
rights	
Note	

***Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA***

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

Osaka University

# What Factors Promote Participation in Local Governance

## —The Philippines as a Case—

Kenichi Nishimura\*

### Abstract

As the institutionalization of citizen participation in local government has been promoted worldwide, analyses of factors that promote citizen participation have been conducted for a variety of countries, both developing and developed. In this context, the relationship between the networking of the population and their participation in local governance is analyzed using various countries as case studies. However, there is no unified findings on the contribution of social capital to the promotion of public participation. In addition to this, several individual-level factors have also been noted to have a significant impact on public participation. In this context, particular attention has been paid to the impact of education, gender and age. Regarding education, no unified view has been found on its impact to participation. On the other hand, it is said that women's participation is lower than men's participation. And it has been pointed out that political participation among the elderly tends to be high worldwide. With the above discussion in mind, I explored what contributes to participation in local governance in the Philippines. The results revealed that age and social capital, that includes marital status, promote participation in local governance, while gender differences are not related to participation levels, and higher education levels are associated with lower participation.

[Key words] Philippines, local governance, social capital, marital status, age, educational background, gender

## 1 Introduction

Direct participation of population in local governance is the foundation of democratic governance and is crucial to the healthy development of local communities (Sisk 2001). With this in mind, the institutionalization of public participation in local governance has been promoted worldwide. And analyses of factors that promote public participation have been carried out for a range of countries, both developing countries and developed countries.

In this context, the relationship between the development of the organization and networking of

the population and their participation in local politics and administration is analyzed using various countries as case studies, with Robert Putnam's discussion of social capital as a reference point. However, there is not always unified findings on the contribution of social capital to the promotion of public participation.

For example, Yasuno (2005) found that there is a positive correlation between social capital and public participation in Japan. Krishna's study also indicates that strong social capital facilitates community participation in rural India (Krishna 2002). On the other hand, Soithong (2011), who analyzed the rela-

---

\* Associate Professor, Center for International Education and Exchange, Osaka University

tionship between social capital and community participation in rural Northern Thailand, notes that there is no significant relationship between the two. Singh and Moody (2021), who analyzed the relationship between social capital and collective participation in India, found that social capital and networks do not fully promote collective participation and tend to favor a few people in the community.

In addition to social capital, several individual-level factors have also been noted to have a significant impact on public participation. In this context, particular attention has been paid to the impact of age, education and gender. Regarding age, it has been pointed out that political participation among the elderly tends to be high worldwide (Sidorenko 2012). But no unified view has been found on the impact of educational background (Willeck and Mendelberg 2022). Furthermore, the actual status of women's participation in local political administration has long been unclear, but the importance of women's participation in local government has recently been identified in the SDGs (UN WOMEN 2021). For this point, women's participation has been reported to be lower than men's (Schlozman et al. 1994; Krishna 2002). Coffé and Bolzendahl (2010), who discussed women's political participation in advanced democracies by mode of participation, found that while there is no gender gap in voting and private activism, women's participation is significantly lower than men's in collective activism, political contact, and party membership.

With the aforementioned issues in mind, this study analyses how social capital and individual attributes affect public participation in local governance, using the Philippines as an example. For the analysis, I use data from our 2019 survey of residents' attitudes to local government conducted in 80 cities and municipalities in the Philippines.

## 2 Research Questions

In this paper, I explore what individual and environmental factors promote citizen participation in local governance. Bronfenbrenner, who developed

a model (Socio-Ecological model) for analyzing the dynamic interrelationships between various individual and environmental factors, lists gender, age, etc. as individual factors, and family, school, friends, church, community, social networks, etc. as factors in the environment surrounding the individual (Bronfenbrenner 1979). Referring to Bronfenbrenner's discussion, I focus on age, education and gender as individual factors. Environmental factor includes marital status, school alumni, hobby groups, religious study group, community groups and gathering, and occupational associations.

There are various forms of participation in local governance, but here I focus on participation in local development planning process such as barangay assembly and sub-district level meeting in barangay, which is the basic local government in the Philippines, and participation in the events sponsored by cities or municipalities such as city/municipal festivals and greening events. These conferences and city/municipality-sponsored events are open to all residents. This allows me to identify how individual factors such as age, education, gender etc. affect the level of participation, regardless of socio-economic class.

As mentioned in the Introduction, while social capital and networks are said to facilitate participation, it has also been discovered that they do not necessarily play a uniform role in participation. And, looking at the individual factor, while older age has been found to promote participation, no consistent results can be found in previous studies on the effect of educational background on participation. And there is a view that women's participation is lower than men's participation, although not enough research has been accumulated on the relationship between gender and participation.

Therefore, this paper will use statistical methods to answer the following questions: 1) what is the relationship between social capital and networks and participation, and 2) what is the relationship between personal attributes such as age, education and gender and participation in the Philippines?

For the analysis, I will use the results of our

survey on local governance - 2019 Opinion Survey on Local Governance in the Philippines - which we conducted in 2019 with 80 local governments in the Philippines.

### 3 Data

An overview of the data used in this paper is as followed. The population consists of individuals over the age of 20 in all 1,515 cities and municipalities, excluding the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao. The design sample is 2,400 by multistage random sampling. 80 municipalities were selected by random sampling (partially significant sampling) from among 300 municipalities surveyed in the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research “Local Government Survey in Southeast Asia: Comparison among Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines” (Principal Investigator: Fumio Nagai) conducted from 2009 to 2013.

First, we extracted Baguio City, Cebu City, and Davao City by significant sampling. After that, we arranged the remaining 297 municipalities in a line from the north, and we extracted 77 municipalities systematically considering the population size. As a result, 55 cities and municipalities were selected from Luzon, 13 from the Visayas and 12 from Mindanao. Among them, 34 are cities and 46 are municipalities. In each municipality, all barangays were arranged in order of the barangay list of the Philippine Statistical Authority, and five barangays were systematically sampled considering population size. As a reserve, 3 barangays were sampled for each municipality.

We selected 6 households to sample 3 males and 3 females in each barangay. If the barangay had a household register, we selected households from the register using a simple random sampling method and if not, we did area sampling. Starting from the barangay hall, we randomly selected starting household (from between 1 and 25 in urban barangays and between 1 and 5 in rural barangays). From there, we selected households with equal intervals, with the interval being 6 in urban barangays and 2 in rural

barangays.

Of the sampled households, we extracted males from the first and odd-numbered households, and females from the second and even-numbered households. Within a household, a Kish grid was used to select one candidate (male or female) aged 20 or older.

In this way, 5 barangays from each city or municipality, 6 households from each barangay, and 1 person from each household (in order of gender) were selected, resulting in a planned sample of 80 cities and municipalities times 5 barangays times 6 people, for a total of 2,400 people.

The fieldwork interview was commissioned to Social Weather Stations, a Philippine polling company, and was conducted from February 24 to March 6 in 2019. If the survey could not be conducted due to refusal, absence, vacant house, etc., the next applicable person (if there is a household list) or the next interval household (if area sampling) was selected for interview. The number of effective responses and effective response rate were 2,400 and 100.0%, respectively.

### 4 Analytical Framework

I conduct a statistical analysis to see if individual and environmental factors promote citizen participation in local governance. For the analysis, I extract the dependent variables as well as independent variables from our survey data.

The dependent variables are the level of participation in local governance. Specifically, 1) frequency of participation in barangay sub-district level meetings, 2) frequency of participation in barangay level meetings such as barangay assembly, and 3) frequency of participation in city/municipality-sponsored events such as festival and tree planting event.

The independent variables include those related to personal attributes and those related to personal network formation. The former are gender, educational background, and age, and the latter includes marital status and frequency of participation in the following various groups and networks which repre-

sent social capital. The groups and networks are community groups and gatherings, hobby groups, religious study groups, school alumni, and occupational associations. I perform the comparison of means using the dependent and independent variables mentioned above.

#### 4-1 Dependent Variables

The dependent variables are the frequency of participation in 1) barangay sub-district level (purok) meetings, 2) barangay level meetings, and 3) city/municipality-sponsored events such as festival and tree planting event. The frequency of participation is classified as follows: 1) more than once a year, 2) every year, 3) four or five times in six years, 4) once every two years, 5) once or twice in six years, and 6) not at all, not applicable. Distribution of frequency is shown in Table 1.

#### 4-2 Independent Variables

##### 4-2-1 Independent Variables related to personal attributes

The independent variables related to personal attributes are age, educational background and gender. The average of age is 45.1 and standard deviation is 15.525. I created a dummy variable with a value of 0 for below average age (under 45 years old) and 1 for above average age (over 46 years old). The frequency distribution of age is as follows: 1287 people (53.6%) are below the average age and 1113

people (46.4%) are above the average age. Distribution of “gender” is as follows: male is 1200 (50%), female is 1200 (50%).

I categorized “educational background” as follows. There are “No formal education”, “Elementary/Primary school”, “Junior high school”, “High school”, “Vocational course/Junior college”, “University/College”, and “Master/PhD program”. Distribution of frequency of “educational background” is indicated in Table 2.

Table 2 Educational Background (N=2400)

	F	%
No formal education	33	1.4
Elementary/Primary school	593	24.7
Junior high school	254	10.6
High school	839	35.0
Vocational course/Junior college	235	9.8
University/College	428	17.8
Master/PhD program	18	0.8
Total	2400	100.0

##### 4-2-2 Independent Variables related to environmental (social) factor

The independent variables related to environmental (social) factor include “marital status”, “community group”, “hobby group”, “occupational association”, “religious study group”, “community

Table 1 Frequency of participation in the meetings and local events (N=2400)

	Meeting at sub-district (purok) level		Meeting at barangay level		Events by city/municipality	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
Not at all, not applicable	794	33.1	742	30.9	790	32.9
Once or twice in six years	295	12.3	279	11.6	239	10.0
Once every two years	132	5.5	121	5.0	119	5.0
Four or five times in six years	105	4.4	95	4.0	85	3.5
Every year	427	17.8	469	19.5	633	26.4
More than once a year	647	27.0	694	28.9	534	22.3
Total	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0

gathering”, and “school alumni”. Frequency distribution of each variable is indicated in Table 3 and Table 4.

For analysis, I convert the frequency of participation in the activities of civil society organizations

into several groups. Regarding “Community groups” and “Religious study group”, the variable is converted to 1 for “Not at all, not applicable,” 2 for “Once every six month or less than that,” and 3 for “once a month or more”. Regarding “Community gathering”, the variable is converted by setting “Not at all, not applicable” to 1, “less than every six month” to 2, and “twice a year or more” to 3. For “Hobby groups”, “Occupational associations”, and “School alumni”, we create dummy variables with 0 for “Not at all, not applicable” and 1 for “Once or more than that”. Tables 5 and 6 show the frequency distributions of the variables newly created by the above variable conversion.

Table 3 Marital Status (N=2400)

	F	%
Never Married	287	12.0
Married	1351	56.3
Separation / Bereavement	289	12.0
With partner / Cohabitation	473	19.7
Total	2400	100.0

Table 4 Frequency of Participation in the Activities of Civil Society Organizations (N=2400)

	Community groups		Hobby groups		Occupational association		Religious study group		Community gathering		School alumni	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Not at all, not applicable	1075	44.8	1305	54.4	1654	68.9	778	32.4	908	37.8	1396	58.2
Less than once every six months	664	27.7	662	27.6	398	16.6	606	25.3	820	34.2	777	32.4
Once every six months	107	4.5	98	4.1	112	4.7	104	4.3	261	10.9	117	4.9
Once a month	436	18.2	136	5.7	175	7.3	258	10.8	309	12.9	79	3.3
Once a week	96	4.0	159	6.6	38	1.6	608	25.3	80	3.3	24	1.0
Every day	22	0.9	40	1.7	23	1.0	46	1.9	20	0.8	6	0.3
Total	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2398	99.9	2399	100.0

Table 5 Frequency of Participation in Civil Society Groups 1 (N=2400)

	Community groups		Religious study group		Community gathering	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	1075	44.8	778	32.4	908	37.8
2	771	32.1	710	29.6	820	34.2
3	554	23.1	912	38.0	672	28.0
Total	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0

Table 6 Frequency of Participation in Civil Society Groups 2 (N=2400)

	Hobby groups		Occupational association		School alumni	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
0	1305	54.4	1654	68.9	1396	58.2
1	1095	45.6	746	31.1	1004	41.8
Total	2400	100.0	2400	100.0	2400	100.0

## 5 Analysis and Results

I perform the compare means to see if there are differences in levels of participation based on individual factors (personal attributes) and environmental factors (marital status and different organizations and networks in which individuals participate). As shown in the previous section, the dependent variables are the frequency of participation in 1) barangay sub-district level meetings, 2) barangay level meetings, and 3) city/municipality-sponsored events. For each dependent variable, I analyze the differences of the level of participation caused by differences in personal attributes and social networks.

### 5-1 Barangay sub-district level meetings

First, I conducted compare means for individual factors such as age, gender, and educational background, and found the following results. As to age, people who are older than the average age participate in meetings significantly more frequently than people who are younger than the average age ( $F(1, 2398) = 16.932, p < .001$ ). On the other hand, regarding educational background, the higher the educational background, the lower the frequency of participation in meetings ( $F(6, 2393) = 10.691, p < .001$ ). And for gender, there were no significant differences in the frequency of participation depending on gender.

Then I run compare means for environmental factors - community groups, hobby groups, occupational association, religious study group, community gathering, and school alumni. Regarding community groups, it was found that the more frequently they participated in their activities, the more frequently they participated in barangay sub-district level meetings ( $F(2, 2397) = 92.655, p < .001$ ). Similarly to the case of community groups, it was revealed that the higher the frequency of participation in the activities of hobby groups ( $F(1, 2398) = 64.485, p < .001$ ), occupational associations ( $F(1, 2398) = 109.174, p < .001$ ), religious study groups ( $F(2, 2397) = 39.269, p < .001$ ), community gatherings ( $F(2, 2397) = 299.813, p < .001$ ), and school alumni ( $F(1, 2398) = 64.646, p < .001$ ), the higher the frequency of participation in barangay

subdistrict-level meetings.

Regarding marital status, those who are married or separated / bereavement participate more frequently in barangay subdistrict level meetings than those who are single or cohabiting ( $F(3, 2396) = 22.442, p < .001$ ).

### 5-2 Barangay level meetings

Among individual factors, regarding age, it was revealed that the older the age, the higher the frequency of participation in barangay-level meetings ( $F(1, 2398) = 36.152, p < .001$ ). However, it was found that the higher the educational background, the lower the frequency of participation in meetings ( $F(6, 2393) = 9.786, p < .001$ ). Regarding gender, it was found that there was no correlation between gender and frequency of participation in barangay-level meetings.

As to the environmental factors, the findings are as follows. On the frequency of attending to civic / resident's groups or community activities, for both community groups ( $F(2, 2397) = 99.280, p < .001$ ), hobby groups ( $F(1, 2398) = 64.049, p < .001$ ), occupational associations ( $F(1, 2398) = 154.301, p < .001$ ), religious study groups ( $F(2, 2397) = 43.078, p < .001$ ), community gatherings ( $F(2, 2397) = 340.989, p < .001$ ), and school alumni ( $F(1, 2398) = 82.305, p < .001$ ), the higher the frequency of participation in these activities, the significantly higher the frequency of participation in barangay-level meetings.

Regarding marital status, those who are married or separated / bereavement participate more frequently in barangay level meetings than those who are single or cohabiting ( $F(3, 2396) = 25.558, p < .001$ ).

### 5-3 City / municipality events

With regard to the individual factor, it is clear that the older the age of the participants, the more frequently they attend events sponsored by the city and municipality ( $F(1, 2398) = 4.406, p < .05$ ). On the other hand, the higher the educational background, the lower the frequency of attending the events ( $F(6, 2393) = 5.418, p < .001$ ). And for gender, there are no significant differences in the frequency of attendance depending on gender.

As to the environmental factors, it was found that the more frequently they participated in the activities of community groups, the more frequently they participated in city / municipality sponsored events ( $F(2, 2397) = 88.559, p < .001$ ). Similarly to the case of community groups, it was revealed that the higher the frequency of participation in the activities of hobby groups ( $F(1, 2398) = 123.936, p < .001$ ), occupational associations ( $F(1, 2398) = 134.260, p < .001$ ), religious study groups ( $F(2, 2397) = 48.383, p < .001$ ), community gatherings ( $F(2, 2397) = 262.775, p < .001$ ), and school alumni ( $F(1, 2398) = 91.796, p < .001$ ), the higher the frequency of attending the city/municipality events.

Regarding marital status, those who are married or separated / bereavement attend more frequently in city / municipality events than those who are single or cohabiting ( $F(3, 2396) = 12.775, p < .001$ ).

#### **5-4 Summary of the results**

This paper examines 1) how individual factors, that is, educational background, gender, and age, influence participation in local governance; and 2) how environmental factors, that is, marital status, social capital and networks surrounding individuals influence participation in local governance.

As a result of the analysis, regarding individual factors, it was found that the older the age, the higher the participation, while the higher the educational background, the lower the participation. It was also found that gender does not affect the level of participation.

Regarding the environmental factors such as social capital and marital status, it was revealed that the higher the frequency of participation in citizen/resident groups or local activities, the higher the level of participation in local governance. And those who are married or separated / bereavement also participate more actively in local governance than those are single or cohabiting.

## **6 Discussion**

### **6-1 Individual factors**

#### **6-1-1 Age**

The analysis found that older age facilitates participation in local governance. Regarding this, there is an argument that points out that older people are more active in political participation than young people, in relation to the strength of their age group identity. Trachtman et al. (2023), who analyzed the relationship between age and political participation using the United States as an example, found that younger voters have a weaker sense of age group identity than older voters. They also found that among young people, individuals with stronger age identities are more likely to participate in political activities such as voting and protesting. They also introduce Campbell's (2003) argument that in the United States, social security issues have made older people politically active (Trachtman et al. 2023: 12–13). To summarize these points, it can be said that older people have a stronger age identity than younger people, and also tend to be more politically active due to their strong interest in social security policy.

In the Philippines, senior citizens are positioned as important targets for the government to provide public services. For example, they receive senior citizen subsidy<sup>1)</sup> and ID-card, which allows them to enjoy special services and discounts at public transportations, hospitals, shops and restaurants. Such services are provided by local government. Therefore, local governments become to be closer to the elderly and, as in the case of the U.S., Filipino elderly are more interested in social security policy and their demands on the government are more intense. Since local government is an institution with which the elder people have regular contact, it would seem that this lowers the hurdle for them to participate in the various events and meetings involving local government.

In addition to this, there are indications that the proliferation of social media is changing the way young people participate in politics. The use of



social media has spread rapidly since the late 2000s, when smartphones were developed (Tanaka and Takahashi 2021: 95). Therefore, young people of the “Millennium Generation” and beyond<sup>2)</sup> are increasingly using social media such as Twitter and Facebook as tools for information dissemination, political discourse exchange, and mobilization, thus transforming their forms of political participation (Utari et al. 2023). In other words, today’s youth generation is not so much concerned with the old ways of political participation, such as attending official meetings and city/municipal sponsored events, but is more inclined toward new forms of political participation through social media. Their mode of political activism has been shifting from the streets to cyberspace (Lim 2009). This change may also be the reason for the younger generation’s lower participation in various barangay meetings and city/municipality-sponsored events compared to the older generation<sup>3)</sup>.

### **6-1-2 Education**

From my analysis, I found that higher educational attainment does not lead to higher participation, but rather reduces participation. How is this explained?

According to Willeck and Mendelberg (2022), who conducted a literature review on the effects of education on political participation, there is a standard model that emphasizes the direct effects of education on promoting political participation, as well as a socialization model that points out that education more broadly instills a democratic character in people and promotes political participation. However, despite rising educational attainment in the United States, voting participation rates are declining. The standard model can’t explain this contradiction. This is why the model of education as a proxy is attracting attention.

This model holds that education does not cause political participation, instead, social status influences it. Furthermore, since an individual’s social status is relative to those around them, as more people receive higher education, the value of their own education

decreases. Therefore, attending university itself does not necessarily promote participation. Although these arguments mainly concern the United States, they seem to have some universality.

In addition to this, the following seems to be a phenomenon unique to the Philippines. That is, highly educated people are in higher socio-economic strata and may therefore be less in desperate need of government services. In fact, a city official in Metro Manila that I interviewed in 2022 said that areas where many high-income people live do not make many requests to the city government, so they do not actively participate in meetings sponsored by the city<sup>4)</sup>.

### **6-1-3 Gender**

Participation of women is reported to be lower than that of men (Schlozman et al. 1994; Krishna 2002). A report prepared by UNDP with Commissions of Elections in the Philippines also found that while women’s voter turnout is higher than men, the proportion of women in elected office is low (Garcia and Ramachandran 2023).

On the other hand, the Philippines has made women’s empowerment an important development goal since the late 1980s, immediately after democratization. In 1989, with the participation of women’s NGOs, the Philippine Development Plan for Women was included in the Medium-Term Philippine Development Plan 1987-1992<sup>5)</sup>.

After this, the Philippine government continued to position women’s issues as an important issue in its national development strategy. During this period, women’s NGOs continued to be actively involved in policy formulation and implementation. As a result, in the 1990s, women’s participation in the policy process was institutionalized and their participation in policy and decision-making expanded (Valdeavilla 1995).

Due to the above-mentioned historical background, in the Philippines, women’s participation in development plans, although not always as elected officials, is enhanced, and it can be said that there is little disparity between men and women in participa-

tion in different kinds of barangay meetings and city/municipality-sponsored events.

## **6-2 Environmental factors**

### **6-2-1 Marital Status**

My analysis found that married or divorced/bereaved individuals participate more frequently in local governance than singles/cohabitants. On this point, a case study in Japan shows that those who are married with children are more likely to vote than singles or divorcees (Nagao 2015).

In light of this point, we can assume that, in the Philippines, married or separated/bereaved persons are more likely to have children than singles or cohabitants too. And the presence of children is expected to increase the interest of married or divorced/bereaved persons in social services such as medical and educational services. Thus, married or separated/bereaved are more inclined to participate in local governance than those who are singles or cohabitants.

### **6-2-2 Attendance in the Activities of Civil/Resident Organizations**

Results of the analysis shows that the higher the frequency of participation in citizen/resident groups or local activities, the higher the level of participation in local governance.

The presence of a close network of active local organizations indicates a high level of social capital. According to Brown and Ashman (1996), who analyzed the relationship between social capital and participation for 13 cases in Asia and Africa, the Philippines is positioned as a case where the presence of a close network of local and grassroots organizations led to a successful urban upgrade project. And it is also said that the Philippine society is permeated by network ties or social capital ties with close family and friends (Abad 2005).

In the Philippines, development of such local organizations has a legal basis. In other words, the local government system has established a mechanism to promote collaboration between NGOs and local residents' organizations and local governments.

The Local Government Code of 1991, in Section 34, identifies people's organizations and NGOs as partners of local government in local development, and in Section 35, encourages cooperation between these organizations and local government. And Section 36 provides for local governments to support these local organizations in implementing the projects.

In summary, in the Philippines, where close ties and networks have existed in society, there are local organizations organized with strong ties and a local autonomy system that strengthens these ties and incorporates them into local development mechanisms. Thus, the relationship between local organizations and the local government is close, and it is understandable that those who are more active in the activities of local organizations will be more actively involved in meetings in the barangay and in events organized by the city or municipality.

## **7 Conclusion**

This paper analyzes what factors promote residents' participation in local governance in the Philippines. As a result, it was found that among personal factors, the older the person, the higher the participation rate, while the higher the educational background, the lower the participation rate. And the impact of gender on participation is not clear. Regarding environmental factors, married or separated/bereaved individuals were more likely to participate in local governance than singles or cohabitants, and those who participated more frequently in civic and residents' groups and community activities were more likely to participate in local governance.

However, there are further issues that need to be clarified, especially with regard to the effects of social capital.

First, participation in this paper refers to attendance at barangay meetings and participation in events sponsored by cities and municipalities, and is not concerned with whether or not it has an impact on policy decisions. When talking about substantive participation in local governance, it is essential to

participate in the making of policies and decisions. In order to determine whether such substantial participation is taking place, it is necessary to examine the relationship between participation indicators used in local government performance evaluations and the level of participation shown in our data.

Second, this study failed to identify the relationship between all aspects of social capital and participation. Social capital includes elements such as “social trust”, “networks”, and “norms of reciprocity”, and this study was able to see the effects of “networks” on participation through the indicator of participation in local organizations. However, it was not possible to fully examine the effects of “trust” and “norms of reciprocity”. As for the effect of the “norm of reciprocity”, my analysis of the effect of education (assuming that a high level of educational attainment allows one to internalize the norms of citizenship through a series of learning experiences) might suggest that the effect of the “norm of reciprocity” on participation is ambiguous or rather negatively affected. However, as to whether academic background strengthens the “norm of reciprocity”, it is necessary to examine the curriculum in higher education in particular.

Third, it is not clear from this analysis whether bridges between different sectors - which is another element of social capital - are being established in the process of participation in various meetings in barangay and city / municipality events. In order to confirm whether bridges are being formed between various sectors in the participation process, we need to look at the relationship between performance indicators of various public services in local government performance evaluations and items related to participation in our data.

The remaining issues mentioned above will be left to future research.

### Acknowledgments

This research was supported by JP15H02600 (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research A, Comparative Study on the Perception of Constituents on Local Governance in Southeast Asia: Comparison Between the Philippines and Indo-

nesia) and JP20H04425 (Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research B, Analysis on Local Governance and Opinion in Southeast Asia: A Comparative Study of Indonesia and the Philippines).

This paper is a revised version of the manuscript presented at the Asian Association for Public Administration 2023 Conference held at Meiji University on December 15-17, 2023.

### Notes

- 1) In the Philippines, the Social Security System, a national agency, pays pensions to the elderly, but in addition to this, some local governments offer subsidies to the elderly.
- 2) The Millennium Generation consists of people born between the early 1980s and mid-1990s (Utari et al. 2023).
- 3) I received useful suggestions on this point from a participant in a session of the 2023 Annual Conference of the Asian Association for Public Administration (AAPA) where I gave a presentation. I would like to express my gratitude by mentioning it here.
- 4) Interview with the officials of a city in Metro Manila, on September 1, 2022.
- 5) Women's activists have been lobbying the government since the 1970s, and the National Commission on the Role of Filipino Women was established in 1975 (Valdeavilla 1995: 94).

### References

- Abad, Ricardo G. (2005). “Social Capital in the Philippines: Results from a National Survey”, *Philippine Sociological Review* 53, 1–57.
- Bronfenbrenner, Urie (1979). *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Etemadi, Felisa U. (2000), “Civil society participation in city governance in Cebu City,” *Environment & Urbanization* 12(1), 57–72.
- Brown, L. David and Ashman, Darcy (1996). “Participation, Social Capital, and Intersectoral Problem Solving: African and Asian Cases”, *World Development* 24(9), 1467–1479.
- Campbell, Andrea Louise (2003). *How Policies Make Citizens: Senior Political Activism and the American Welfare State*, Princeton University Press.
- Coffé, Hilde and Bolzendahl, Catherine (2010). “Same Game, Different Rules? Gender Differences in Political Participation”, *Sex Roles* 62, 318–333.
- Garcia, George Erwin M. and Ramachandran, Selva

- (2023). Beyond a Glance: Digitalization and Enhanced Data Governance for Women's Political Participation in the Philippines, United Nations Development Programme, (<https://www.undp.org/philippines/blog/beyond-glance-digitalization-and-enhanced-data-governance-womens-political-participation-philippines>) [Last access date: November 10, 2023].
- Krishna, Anirudh (2002). "Enhancing Political Participation in Democracies: What is the Role of Social Capital?", *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(4), 437–460.
- Lim, Niel Niño (2009). "Novel or Novice: Exploring the Contextual Realities of Youth Political Participation in the Age of Social Media", *Philippine Sociological Review* 57, 61–78.
- Nagao, Yukiko (2015). *Who Voted in the 2009 House of Representatives Election?: From the Viewpoint of the Japanese Intermediate Groups*, University of Tokyo Institute of Social Science.
- Schlozman, Kay Lehman, Burns, Nancy and Verba, Sidney (1994). "Gender and the Pathways to Participation: The Role of Resources", *The Journal of Politics*, 56(4), 963–990.
- Sidorenko, Alexandre (2012). *Participation of Older Persons in Political and Public Life*, presented in International Forum on the Rights of Older Persons (Mexico City).
- Singh, Mudit Kumar and Moody, James (2022). "Do social capital and networks facilitate community participation?", *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 42(5/6), 385–398.
- Sisk, Timothy D. et al. (2001). *Democracy at the Local Level: The International IDEA Handbook on Participation, Representation, Conflict Management and Governance*, Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- Soithong, Wanlapat (2011). *Social Capital, People's Political Participation and Institutional Performance of Local Government in the North of Thailand*, PhD Thesis.
- Tanaka, Hiromi and Takahashi, Kanae (2021). "The Youth's Use of Social Media and Gender: The Case of University Students Who Use Social Networking Services", *Journal of Information and Communication Studies* (Meiji University), 20, 95–110.
- Trachtman, S., Anzia, S. F., and Hill, C. (2023). *Age Group Identity and Political Participation* (Research Note), UC Berkeley.
- UN WOMEN. (2021). *Women's Representation in Local Government: A Global Analysis*, UN WOMEN.
- Utari, Wulandari, Yuni, Colby, and Crespi (2023). "Political Participation of the Millennial Generation in General Elections: The Influence of Education, Social Media, and Economic Factors", *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan dan Humaniora* 12(3), 183–198.
- Valdeavilla, Ermelita V. (1995). "Breakthroughs and Challenges of Making the Philippine Government Work for Gender Equality", *IDS Bulletin* 26(3), 94–101.
- Willeck, Claire and Mendelberg, Tali (2022). "Education and Political Participation", *Annual Review of Political Science* 25, 89–110.
- Yasuno, Satoko (2005). "Personal network, social capital and political attitudes in JGSS-2003," *JGSS Research Series No. 1*, 153–167